

MISCELLANEOUS
TRACTS
RELATING TO
ANTIQUITY.

By *JOHN CHAPMAN*, D. D.
Archdeacon of *Sudbury*, and Chaplain to his Grace
the Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

Now carefully revised, and corrected with *Additions*,
and collected into one VOLUME.



L O N D O N:
Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball in
Ave-Mary-Lane.
MDCCXLII.

MISCELLANEOUS
TRACTS
RELATING TO
ANTIQUITY.



BY JOHN CHURCHMAN, D.D.
Archdeacon of Ely, and Chaplain to his Grace
the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

Now carefully revised, and corrected with additions,
collected into one Volume.



LONDON:
Printed for S. BART, at the Bible and Ball in
St. Dunstons Church-yard.
MDCCLXXII.

Primitive Antiquity

Explained and Vindicated.

Printed first in the Year MDCCXXXII.

Primitive Antiquity



Explained and indicated.

Printed for the Trustees of the British Museum

Primitive Antiquity

Explained and Vindicated.

BEING

REMARKS

On a Book intituled,
Christianity as old as the Creation.

PART I.

THE SECOND EDITION.

'Tis a firm Persuasion among them, that there are but two Sorts in Mankind, Deceivers and Deceived, Cheats and Fools. Hence it is, that dreatning and waking they have one perpetual Theme, *Priestcraft Phil. Lips. Part I. p. 12.*

Δεινὴ τις ἡ κακία, καὶ τῶν δέων ἀμαθία, καταρροεῖν ὧν ἐκ
ῥιδεν, καὶ ἐπισύρειν. Porphy. περ. αποχ. Lib. 2. §. 53.

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖται. Can. Nic. 6.

To which is added in an APPENDIX,
A true ACCOUNT of the *STOICAL FATE*,
In Defence of the Lord Bishop of *LONDON*.

L O N D O N :

Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball
in *Ave-Mary-Lane*. M DCC XLII.

Primitive Ancestry

Established and Vindicated

BY J. W. G.

REMARKS

On a Book published

Chapman & Co. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100



The Second Edition

The first edition of this work was published in 1811, and was immediately received with great favour. It has since been reprinted several times, and has been translated into French, German, and Italian. The present edition is a new and complete one, and contains many additions and corrections. It is published by Chapman & Co. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100

To be had of the Author, at the British Museum, in the Library of the Lord Bishop of London.

L O W D O W

Printed for S. B. in the Bible and Ball in New-Market, Middlesex.

PREFACE.

THE Design of the following Sheets was not meerly of the *Personal* kind, to expose the Falsehoods or Blunders of one particular Writer, which would greatly contract it in Use and Value, and render it comparatively of little Concern to the Publick in general; but it was laid more deep and extensive, to represent some important Passages of Antiquity in their true Light, and thus to prevent or remove several mischievous Prejudices against it, which the Sceptical Tribe has for many Years been industriously propagating Abroad and at Home, to pervert the Minds, and shake the Faith of all common Believers.

The *Freethinkers*, as they please to call themselves, are wise enough in their Generation to know, that if once by any Arts they could blast the Credit of the Primitive Churches, in Point of Learning and Discernment, Integrity and Piety, their Work would soon be done with a great Part of Mankind in these Days; with those either in High or Low Life, who are little acquainted with Knowledge of this Sort, and at the same Time

A

are

are easily susceptible of ill Impressions, from a frequent Indulgence in Pleasures or Vices, and from the Number of corrupt Examples about them. In this State of Things it might be no Matter of Difficulty, to infuse into the Great as well as the Vulgar, such Notions of Weakness and Fraud together in the earliest Christians, and such Jealousies of Enthusiasm or Imposture on that Side, as might produce in Time a fix'd Distrust of the original Evidences of our Religion, and of the whole Authority of the sacred Scriptures. Accordingly one principal Reason, among others, why the Infidel Taint has diffused itself so widely among us, is probably that very ill Light in which the distant Ages of the Gospel have been shewn to the World by some Moderns, who either to serve an *Hypothesis*, or from a Humour of Cavilling, or Affectation of Criticism, have blacken'd Antiquity beyond all Bounds of Reason and Truth.

Sensible enough I am, that Failings there were in the old Christian Writers, which to dissemble would be Folly or Partiality entirely needless, since the same may be charged on the greatest of our Moderns; and always will be, I am afraid, while Men are Men; but these are not gross and unpardonable Defects, especially when they are seen as they really are; but the Case is, those Failings, I do assert from my own Knowledge, have been
mon-

P R E F A C E.

3

monstrously * exaggerated, others groundlessly charged in the Account, and the real Virtues and Abilities of the Ancients have been so far clouded and disguised, that with the same Malignity in the Drawing, the Character even of a *Grotius* might become the Subject of Scorn and Ridicule.

I shall say no more at present on this Head, but would only assure the Reader, that in the following Articles nothing is offer'd in Vindication of Antiquity, but what appear'd to me to be the genuine Truth upon the strictest Examination. And I hope whatever Defects may be discernible in the Style or Method, he will see enough upon the Whole, to guard him from iniquitous Delusions, together with frequent Notices of Things not every where obvious, besides others entirely new, and worth a careful Observance.

* Neque illorum imperitia superstitione mixta est ferenda, qui indicari tales nævos pati non possunt; neque rursus illorum inhumanitas, ac pæne dixerim, impietas, qui infestis animis monumenta sanctorum virorum tractant, & propter humanos istiusmodi lapsus sese efferunt, illos deprimunt. *Is. Casaub. cont. Baron. Ex. 1. N. 26.*

PART I.

SECT. I.

Of ANCIENT FRAUDS.

REMARK I.

AS for the holy Fathers, says he^a, they as Daillé has a whole Chapter to prove, did not think themselves in their *Controversial Writings* (and most of theirs were such) obliged to speak the Truth; but that every thing was lawful which served to gain the Victory. They thought they might by way of Oeconomy or Dispensation say one thing and mean the contrary. From hence we are to look upon the Fathers as arrant Juglers and Jesuits. They did not think themselves obliged to speak the Truth. That is, in plain *English* and our Author's Intention, they would lye, deceive, and impose without the least Scruple of Conscience. That every thing was lawful which served to gain the Victory. Just as Sallust says of Catiline,

^a Christianity as old, &c. p. 161. Ed. 4to. p. 142. Ed. 8vo.

Subdolus, varius, cujuscumque rei simulator ac dissimulatus, — quia bonæ artes desunt, dolis atque fallaciis contendit. That is, in other Words, stick at no sort of Means, however wicked and fraudulent, to gain the End. Nay farther, they thought *Oeconomy* and *Dispensation* would justify them wholly in *saying one Thing and meaning the contrary*. True Popish Faith towards Hereticks, *aliud clausum in pectore, aliud promptum in lingua habere*, and that by a Papal Indulgence and *Dispensation*, with Merit and Sanctity in Perfection. Then for Authority, *Daille* has a whole Chapter to prove it. Here's a little Mistake in the Quantity of *Daille's* Proof, for he really has not half a Chapter upon the *Controversial* Writings of the Fathers, which are those our Author is speaking of. But to let this pass, there is a far greater in the Quality and Substance of it. Whatever our Author may think of *Daille's* Performance, this I know and assure him, that it has not been thought by Men deeply acquainted with the Fathers, a sound and irrefragable Piece. Dr. *Smith* of Cambridge, a Man of known Abilities and Learning, who is said, by a vulgar error ^b, to have given it an English Translation, express'd very often his utter Dislike of it, and had frequently Thoughts of writing an accurate Answer to it himself. But his learned and intimate Friend Mr. *Scribner* went on

^b Vid. *Scribner. Præf. ad Apolog. adv. Dall.*

with

with the Doctor's Design, and publish'd in the Year 1672, his large *Apologia pro S. Ecclesiæ patribus adversus Johannem Dallæum*. After him Bishop Beveridge^c, Dr. Cave^d, Mr. Wootton^e, and Mr. Reeves^f of our own Writers pass'd their several Censures on the same Book. Add to these many Foreigners, mention'd by the celebrated Buddeus^g, and particularly Peter Zornius, a very learned Protestant, who wrote a *Vindiciæ patrum per omnes fidei Christianæ articulos, oppositæ Joanni Dallæo*^h, and lastly Mr. Buddeus himselfⁱ. Nay, even Mr. Le Clerc, the greatest Advocate for this Piece of *Dallæus*, cannot help allowing some Defects and Mistakes in it^k. So that a confident Reference to a Book as unanswerable, which was wrote an hundred Years ago, without the least Notice of the many repeated Animadversions upon it since that Time, argues either extreme Weakness or Disingenuity, either an easy Deception in the Man himself, or a tricking Design to deceive others. But this, you'll say, is nothing to the Merits of the Cause. *Daillé* may be still in the Right, tho' others have thought him in the Wrong, and the Charge now brought against

c Procem. ad Vind. Can. Eccl. Primit. d Epistola Apologet.
e Præf. ad Clem. Rom. Epist. f Pref. to Apolog. g Isagoge
p. 606. h Ibid. p. 607. i Ibid. Ut Dallæus, ita & Jo.
Clericus ipse, quem illius patrocinium in se suscepisse diximus,
inter censores patrum iusto rigidiores refertur. k Hæc tō non
dico, quòd singulos versus ejus libri proberim, aut nusquam à Dal-
læo dissentiam. Epistol. Critic. 4. p. 117.

the Fathers will stand as a Proof of their Guilt, unless you deny and invalidate the Evidence. Well, pray, what are the mighty Arguments? Why, *they thought they might by way of Oeconomy or Dispensation, say one thing and mean the contrary.* That is, by their own Confession, *they did not think themselves obliged to speak the Truth, but that every thing was lawful which served to gain the Victory.* So then, as far as I can perceive, the Whole of this black Impeachment is only an Inference from the Greek Word *οἰκονομία*, which you translate *Oeconomy or Dispensation*, without explaining or settling its Meaning. *Homine imperito nunquam quicquam injustius.* *Οἰκονομία* in Greek must signify forsooth *Dispensation* in English, and that in the worst and most extensive Sense, implying an arbitrary Suspension or Breach as Occasion requires, of the great and inviolable Rules of Piety, Truth, and Equity. This is a rash and idle Way of annexing modern Ideas to ancient Words, that has bred Abundance of Confusion and Error in many Understandings, and misled *Daillé*, and our Author particularly in the Case before us, into such injurious Conceptions and Aspersions of the primitive Writers. *Οἰκονομία*, in *Scripture* and Ecclesiastical Use, has generally a different Sense from what it had anciently in the *Civil* and *Political*, and has hardly any one Idea belonging to it, which the English Word *Dispensation*

(as its commonly understood) conveys to the Mind. *Dispensation* generally implies with us¹, an *Abrogation, Relaxation, and Suspension* of standing Laws and Rules of Acting. And then is it justly liable to Blame and Exception, when it is not exercised either on a proper Subject, or by a proper Authority. But οἰκονομία in the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* signifies another thing. To make this Matter clear beyond Exception, I shall here produce a considerable Number of Instances out of Antiquity, which will clear the Fathers Reputation at present, and may prevent the like Misconstructions for the future. The Ministry of the Gospel is called οἰκονομία, 1 Cor. 9. 17. Οἰκονομίαν πεπιστευμαι. In our *English Translation*, *A Dispensation of the Gospel is committed to me*. In the *Vulgate Latin*, *Dispensatio mihi credita est*. In the old *Syriack* it is rendred by ܠܚܒܐ; *Rabat*, translated in the *Polyglot Prefectura*; but signifying also very appositely *Augmentation, Nourishment*, and the likem, coming from the same Root with the *Chaldee* רבית *Rebith* and תרבות *Tarbitb* of the same Signification. *Grotius* says on this Place, that the *Greek Word* οἰκονομία expresses the *Hebrew word* מפקדון *Pe-kuddab* signifying *Inspection, or Superintendence*. So again, *Eph. 3. 2*. Εἴ γε ἡ χάρις τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς.

¹ *Stillingsfleet's Eccles. Cases. Part 2. p. 146.*

^m *Vid. Lexic. Castell, Vol. 2. p. 3498.*

If you have heard of the Dispensation of the Grace of God which is given me to youward. And again, Colof. i. 25. *Ἡς ἐκινίμην ἐγὼ Δι' ἄρκονες* *ἕτ' τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῷ Θεῷ.* Whereof I am made a Minister according to the Dispensation of God &c. I hope the word οἰκονομία *Oeconomy* or *Dispensation*, gives no room for suspicions of Fraud and Imposture in these passages of Scripture. Let us now try it in the Fathers: The Incarnation of *Christ* is often express'd in them by the word οἰκονομία. So says *Theodore*ⁿ, *The Incarnation of God the Word we call οἰκονομία* (or, the *Oeconomy*.) So *Antiochus* Bishop of *Ptolemais*^o, *Do not confound the two Natures, and then you will be found as to the οἰκονομία.* So *Justin Martyr*^p, *Eusebius*^q, and *Cyril of Alexandria*^r. And the learned *Valesius*^{*} has justly

ⁿ Τὴν ἐκινίμωσιν τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ καλοῦμεν ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ. Dialog. 2.

^o Μὴ συγχέωμεν τὰς φύσεις, καὶ οὐ τὰς αρχὰς πρὸς τὴν ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ. Ap. eund. ibid.

^p Dialog. cum Tryph. Καὶ ἔτις ἐτιλιόταν πρὶν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὴν ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ τὴν κατὰ τὸ βέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς μετασχηματίζων αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ σκευασθῆναι ἰλθεῖν. p. 369. Ed. Thirl.

^q Οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἢ ἀπὸ πρώτης ἀρχομεν τῆς κατὰ τὸν Σαντῆρα καὶ Κόρνοι ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ. Eccl. Hist. Lib. i. Cap. i.

^r Ἀγνοῶσιν — εἰσάπαν τῆς μετὰ σαρκὸς ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ τοῦ μεγάλου τοῦ μυστήριον. Cyril. adv. Julian. Lib. 6. p. 213. Ἄμεινον αὐτῷ (τῷ Χριστῷ) περιλασσαι τὴν ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ. Ibid. ἐκινίμωσιν, καὶ τὴν ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ τελείας, εἰς ἀπάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τῆς ἀποστολῆς ἐκτελέψεν.

^{*} Veteres Græci οἰκονομίαν vocârunt quicquid Christus in terris gessit ad procurandam salutem generis humani. Itaque ἡ πρώτη τοῦ Χριστοῦ οἰκονομία est incarnatio; sicut postrema οἰκονομία est passio. Errant qui existimant οἰκονομίαν nihil aliud signi-

observ'd of the Antient Greeks in general, that they all express'd the whole Life and Actions of *Christ* here on Earth, by this one word οἰκονομία. From hence it came to be an usual phrase among the Antients, to say, that such a thing was done or said by our Lord, his Apostles, and themselves, οἰκονομικῶς and κατ' οἰκονομίαν, that is, by way of *Oeconomy*. The true, just, and proper meaning of which Expressions will best be understood by particular Instances of its Use and Application. It is said in *St. Mark* Cap. 13. v. 32. *Of that Day and that Hour knoweth no Man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* This the Fathers say was spoke by *Jesus* to his Disciples by way of *Oeconomy*^s, or as they themselves explain that expression, in reference to his *Incarnation and Messiahship*^r.

significare quam incarnationem; quippe latius patet vox οἰκονομία, & totam Christi inter homines vitam complectitur. Annot. in Euseb. Lib. 1. Cap. 1. Vid. et. Suicer. Thesaur. Tom. 2. p. 458. & seq.

† Αγνοεῖν ἔφησεν ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΚΩΣ, ἀποσώζων τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι τὴν αὐτῇ πρέπουσαν τάξιν, Cyril. Alex. Thesaur. p. 218. Πῶς οὐκ ἀνέλαυνον εἰς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα φέρειν τὰ ἀνθρωπίνως εἰρημμένα; πῦτο γὰρ ἔστιν ἀποδιχισμὸς τῆς ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ τοῦ τρόπου. Ibid. διὰ τίνα λόγον ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ ἀπέφρητον. p. 219. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΕΙ γὰρ τοι Χρῆστος, μὴ εἰδέναι λέγων τὴν ἄραν ἐκεῖνων, καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῶς ἀγνέει. p. 223.

‡ Οὐκ ἀγνέων ὁ Λόγος, ἢ Λόγος ἔστιν καὶ Σοφία τοῦ Πατρὸς τὴν οὐκ οἶδα φησὶν, ἀλλὰ δεικνύων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ὃ μάλιστα πρέπει τὸ ἀγνέειν. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὴν ἡμῶν ἀπεισάλετο σάρκα, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν ἡμῶν ἀγνοίαν ἔχειν ἐξημετέζετο. p. 220.

Ignoratio ejus, secundum quod omnes thesauri in eo scientiæ latent, dispensatio potius quam ignoratio sit. Hilar. De Trin. Lib. 9. Cap. 62. Necessè est, ut id quod sciens nescit, & nesciens scit, nihil aliud quàm vel loquendi dispensatio sit vel gerendi,

In the same Manner they interpret the *Scripture* Accounts of his Hunger and Thirst and Weeping, and other Passions and Infirmities incident to human Nature^v, in Answer to the *Arian* and *Eunomian* Objections. Again, ^w when our Saviour asked in the Crowd, who it was that had touch'd him ; when he enquir'd of

rendi. Ibid. Cap. 63. *Per dispensationem aut agendi, aut protestandi aut demonstrandi sic nescit ut sciat ; & sic non nescit, ut nesciat.* Ibid. Cap. 68.

Διά σε καὶ τὴν ἄραν καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς κρείσσεως ἀγνόει καίτοι οὐδὲν ἐλάτθανε τὴν ὄντως σοφίαν.—Τοῦτο ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΕΙ διὰ τὴν σὴν διδενείαν.—Διὰ τῆς περσποικτικῆς ἀγνοίας ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΕΙ. Basil. M. Ep. 141.

υ Εἰς τέλος διεξάγει τὴν ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ ἡπείχεται.—ἐξεταζέτω δ' ἐισαφκου παρουσίας ἡ ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ, καὶ πορρω παντὸς κείσονται σπανδάλι τινὲς τ' ἀκρωμένων, ὅσα περὶ τῷ Σωτῆρος ἀνθρωπινώτερον λέγουσιν αἱ δεῖαι γραφαί.—Ἐπιτρέπει τῷ σώματι καὶ τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι τὰ τῇ φύσει αὐτῇ (leg. αὐτῆς) πρέσποντα παθεῖν. Cyril. Alex. Thes. p. 231, 233. Τὰ μὲν ὑψηλότερα πρῶτα γε τῇ δεύτητι,—τὰ δὲ ταπεινότερα τῷ σωθῆτορ καὶ τῷ διά σε κενωθέντι καὶ σαρκωθέντι, οὐδὲν δὲ χεῖρον εἶπεν καὶ ἀνθρωπιθέντι, ἵνα—μάθῃς ὑψηλότερον εἶναι καὶ σωθῆναι τῇ δεύτητι,—καὶ γινώσκῃς τὸς μὲν φυσίως λόγῳ, τὸς δὲ ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ. Gregor. Nazian. Orat. 35.

w Cum cogitationum gestorumque non ignarus cognitor, interdum de cogitatis gestisque quasi ignarus interrogat, velut de tactu fimbriæ mulierem, vel de dictorum diffensione Apostolos, vel de sepulchro Lazari stantes, non nesciens intelligendus est nescire, sed loquens. Neque enim natura fert, ut qui absens Lazarum mortuum sepultumque sciat, sepulchri locum nesciat ; & qui cogitationes videt, mulieris fidem non cognoverit ; & qui necessitatem non habet de aliquo interrogandi, diffensionem Apostolorum ignoraverit. Sed ei, qui novit omnia, ea ipsa quæ non nescit, *dispensatio* est aliquando nescire se loqui : dum aut apud Abraham scientia dissimulatur in tempus, aut apud stultas virgines & iniquitatis operarios cognitio negatur indignis, aut in sacramento filii hominis, interrogatio ignorantis *ex homine* est ; in his se omnibus veritati corporeæ nativitatis accommodans, quibus naturæ nostræ infirmitas detinetur. Hilar. de Trinit. Lib. 9. §. 66.

his Disciples, who Men said that he was, when he ask'd where *Lazarus* who had died was laid, it was not from any Ignorance, say the Fathers, for *Jesus Christ* the Son of God was omniscient, but οἰκονομικῶς *by way of Oeconomy*. Sure they did not intend to insinuate, that *Jesus* was guilty of any Fraud or Iniquity in these Questions. This would be shocking and detestable to those his faithful and pious Disciples, and cannot be possibly supposed of them, by any one possessed of the least Degree of Sense and Modesty. All indeed they meant by this Expression, when applied to their Lord and Redeemer, was only, that for wise, and good, and weighty Reasons, these Questions were asked; and that these particular Means and Opportunities were made use of by *Jesus*, to some unknown but useful and gracious Ends. Where is there now any odious Idea or *innuendo* in this *Oeconomy*? Certainly *Jesus* might wave a Divine Omniscience for the present, and speak as a real Man (whose Nature he had taken upon him) for secret Ends instrumental to the Good and Instruction of Mankind.

AGAIN, *Oeconomy* signified with the Ancients sometimes a mere prudential *Accommodation*. So when *St. Paul* speaks thus to the *Corinthians* x. *These things, Brethren, I*

x 1 Cor. 4. 6.

have

have in a figure transferr'd to myself, and to Apollos for your sakes. St. Chrysostome calls it a συγκατάλασις and οἰκονομία, a piece of Condescension and Management^y. Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews^z. And how was this done, says St. Chrysostome^a? Why, by practising Circumcision (in some few instances) in order to take it away (in the end). And for this reason he does not say (I became) a Jew, but as a Jew. Which was an οἰκονομία, a prudent piece of management. The same explication does Oecumenius give of this Text. The Apostle does not say I became a Jew, but as a Jew, to shew that what was done was οἰκονομία, or by way of Oeconomy^b. The most extraordinary οἰκονομία attributed to St. Paul by the Fathers, is that of his behaviour to St. Peter^c. When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blam'd, (ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν, because he was condemn'd) For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come

y Παῦλος μίλλον ὑπὲρ ἑτέρων ἐγκαλεῖν, τῶν μὲν ὡς ἀδικοῦντων, ὅτι ὡς παρὰ τὸ μέτρον πρωμύνων, αὐτὰ μὲν οὐκ ἔθηκε τὰ αἰσώματα· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προσηγορίας καὶ τῆς ἀπέλλου τὸν λόγον προσήγαγεν, ἵνα αἰδοῦμενοι τοῦτον διώκωμεν τὴν θρασύτητα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἰδόντες, τότε λοιπὸν ἀπεκάλυψε ὑπὲρ ὧν ταῦτα ἔλεγεν. ἦν δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ὑπόκρισις, ἀλλὰ συγκατάλασις καὶ ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ. in loc. z 1 Cor. 9. 20.

a Καὶ πῶς ἐγένετο ταῦτο; ὅτι ἐξέπλεον, ἵνα καθέλη αἰσώτομήν. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εἶπεν, Ἰουδαῖος, ἀλλ', ὡς Ἰουδαῖος, ὅτι ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ ἦν. Idem. in loc.

b Οὐκ εἶπεν δὲ, Ἰουδαῖος ἐγνωμῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς Ἰουδαῖος, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ ἦν τὸ γνώμεν. Ἀλλῶς. Οὐδὲ πανταχοῦ τὸ, ὡς, προσκαίμενον, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΚΩΣ ταῦτα γέγονεν.—ἀλλὰ μετὰ πληρώσεως ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΗΣΕΝ. Oecumen. in loc. c Gal. 2. 11. &c.

he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the Circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? All this St. Chrysostome^d, Jerom^e, and Oecumenius^f under-

d Οὐ μάχης ἦν τὰ ρήματα ἀλλ' ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ. — Παῦλ^ο ἰπ-
πλήθει, καὶ Πίτρος ἀνέχεσθαι, ἵνα δοκαλυφῇ τοῦ Διδασκάλου ὁ σιγῶν-
τ^ο, εὐκολώτερον οἱ μαθηταὶ μεταστῶνται. — Εἰ μὲν ἀκούον ταῦτα
Πίτρος ἀντίλεγε, καλῶς ἂν τις ἐμύμψατο, ὡς τις ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ
διατρεπεμένης· νυνὶ δὲ, ἐκείνου μὲν ἰπτιωῶντ^ο, τούτου δὲ σιγῶντ^ο,
πολὺς τοῖς ἑξ. Ἰουδαίων φόβος ἰκνέται. Chrysost. in Gal. Chap. 2.
v. 12.

c Ex eo quod Petrus antequam quidam de Jerosolymis Antio-
chiam venirent, edebat cum gentibus, ostenditur non eum ob-
litum fuisse præcepti, nullum hominem communem & immun-
dum dicere; sed quia propter eos qui adhuc Legem observan-
dam putabant, paululum se à convictu subtraxerat gentium;
ita ut etiam cæteri, qui ex Judæis erant, similiter fa-
cerent; & Barnabas qui cum Paulo in gentibus Evange-
lium prædicabat, hoc facere cogeretur; qui Antiochiæ credide-
rant ex Gentibus, nec fuerant circumcisi, compellebantur ad
Legis onera transcendere; non intelligentes dispensationem Petri,
qui Judæos salvari cuperet; sed putantes ita se Evangelii habere
rationem. Quum itaque vidisset Apostolus Paulus periclitari
gratiam Christi, novâ bellator ejus, usus est arte pugnandi: ut
Dispensationem Petri quâ Judæos salvari cupiebat, novâ ipse
contradictionis dispensatione corrigeret; & resisteret ei in fa-
ciem; non arguens propositum, sed quasi in publico contradi-
cens: ut ex eo quod Paulus eum arguens resistebat, hi qui
crediderant ex gentibus fervarentur. Hieron. Comm. in Gal.
Lib. 1. Cap. 2.

f Οὐ μάχης οὐδὲ καταγνώσεως ἦν τὸ πρὸς Παῦλον ἀντιστήναι τῷ Πίτρῳ,
ἀλλ' ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ διὰ συγκατάθεσιν οἱ περὶ Πέτρον
ἦν

stand as said and done *Oeconomically* by St. Paul, in order to free the Jewish Converts from a strict and scrupulous adherence to the Law of Moses, and to prevent the Gentile Converts from a rigorous subjection to Legal observances. This interpretation they also defend with weighty and plausible reasons, thinking St. Paul's behaviour on this occasion to be very artful and politick, nothing repugnant to Virtue and Honesty, nor inconsistent with the Person and Character of an Apostle.

ANOTHER οἰκονομία mention'd and practis'd by the ancient Fathers, was that relating to Rebaptization. St. Basil in his famous Epistle to *Amphilochius*, speaks of its signal use and application in Church-Affairs. After he has weigh'd and consider'd the validity of Lay-Baptism, and determin'd against it according to Canonical strictness, he then subjoyns this

ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ συνεχώρουν τὴν ᾤκητομένην, κατὰ μικρὸν βουλόμενοι τοὺς ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον ἀγάγειν, ἐλθὼν ὁ Πιτρεὺς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, ἄλλοι μὲν οὐδεὶς ἦν τῶν ἐξ Ἰουδαίων πιστὸς εἰσεῖν, ἀδιαφόρως μετὰ τῶν ἐξ ἰδιῶν πιστευσάντων συνηθίειν, ὅτι δὲ παρεγίνοντο, ἵνα μὴ αὐτοὺς σκανδαλίση ἢ ἐκ ἀδελφῆς διττας, ὑπετέλλειν τὸ συνηθίσαι ἐκείνοις. Τῆτον δὲ αἰτίαν, ὡς εἰρηται, ἢ ἐκείνων ἀδελφεία. Καὶ τὸ τὴν Παῦλον δὲ φανερῶς ἀλλὰ μὴ κατ' ἰδίαν ἀντισηῖν τῷ Πιτρεὶ ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ ἦν, ἵνα ὁρῶντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰουδαίων πιστοὶ τὸν Διδάσκαλον αὐτὴν (ἢ αὐτῶν) Πιτρὸν ἐγκαλοῦμενοι φαιεῖσιν, τὶ δεῖται μὴ σὺν ἑστῇ (Leg. cum Cod. MS. Cantab. συνηθίει) τοῖς ἀκροβύτοις, καὶ μὴ ἀντιλεγόντα, γινώσκιν ὡς εὐχρηστικῆς λοιπὸν ἢ παρατήρησις τοῦ Νόμου μετὰ τὴν πίσιν, ἀλλὰ πρόφασιν παραχρῆστα τοῦ ἐγκαλέσθαι Πιτρὸν. Oecumenius in loc. Vid. etiam Sanderfon. Prælect. 3. §. 3.

tender

tender and moderate Direction. However, says he^b, as some of the Asian Bishops have thought it proper to admit the Baptism of Laicks οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα τῶν πολλῶν, for the sake of good Oeconomy or Conduct with regard to many Persons, e'en let it be admitted. And a little lower speaking of the Baptism of the Encratite, he concludes thus. Upon the whole ^h therefore I think, that as there has been nothing as yet clearly determin'd about them, it behoves us to set aside their Baptism; and to baptize any one that comes to the Church, notwithstanding he may already have receiv'd Baptism from them. If indeed this way of proceeding should prove any hindrance τῇ καθόλου οἰκονομία to the general good Administration of the Church, then we must return to Custom, καὶ τοῖς οἰκονομήσασιν τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς πατέραςιν ἀκολουθεῖν, and follow the (practice of) the Fathers, who have wisely directed our Church-Affairs. I have chose to render οἰκονομίας ἕνεκεν and τῇ καθόλου οἰκονομία in these passages of St. Basil differently from the Translator, Mr. Thorndikeⁱ, and the learned Mr. Bingham^k, because I

g Επειδὴ δὲ ὅλως ἴδωκεν τισὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ εἶναι τοῖς πολλοῖς, δεχθῆναι αὐτῶν τὸ βάπτισμα, ἔγωγε δικαίως. Basil. Epist. Canon. ad Amphiloc. can. 1.

h Νομίζω τοίνυν, ὅτι ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐδὲν ἔστι περὶ αὐτῶν φανερῶς διηγορούμενον, ἡμᾶς προσήκει ἀθετεῖν αὐτῶν τὸ βάπτισμα. καὶ τις ἢ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰληθῶς, προσέοντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ βαπτίζειν. Εὰν μὲντοι μίλλῃ τῇ καθόλου ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ ἐμποδὼν ἴστασθαι τοῦτο, πάλιν τοῖς ἱεροῦ χρηστέον, ὧς τοῖς ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΗΣΑΣΙ περὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς πατέραςιν ἀκολουθεῖν.

i De Jure Finiend. Controv. Eccles. p. 263.

k Antiqu. Christ. Ch. Vol. 1. p. 597. Ed. Fol.

thought

thought their interpretation of the words not perfectly agreeable to the sense of the Context. They all interpret them by *Dispensatio*, whereas the *Dispensatio* was not the οἰκονομία it self, but the consequence of it. This will appear very visible by applying the word *Dispensatio* to both the passages of *Basil*. Some of the *Asian Bishops* admitted Lay Baptism οἰκονομίας ἐνεκα τῶν πολλῶν, for the sake of Dispensation in many cases, or with regard to many Persons. And again, he advises *Amphilochius* to allow even the Baptism of the *Encratite*, if the not allowing it should prove detrimental to the τῇ χριστοῦ οἰκονομία to the general Dispensation. This its plain sounds harsh and unnatural. For it is not probable, that they admitted any thing irregular for the sake of Dispensation, but its certain that they sometimes dispens'd with irregular things for higher ends, that is, for the general good of the Church.

I CANNOT but observe in this place, that the *Stoicks* speak of an οἰκονομία among them very nearly resembling the Ecclesiastical. So *Marcus Antoninus*¹. What is Praise to a Man, (I say nothing of what it is to a dead one) but even to a living one, πλὴν ἄρα δι' οἰκονομίας τινα unless on Prudential Views? and in Book 11th he shews the difficulty of judging right of o-

¹ Οὐδὲν λέγω, ὅτι πρὸς τὴν τιμηρότητα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸς ζῶντα τίς ὁ ἵκανος, πλὴν ἄρα δι' οἰκονομίας τινα; Lib. 4. §. 19.

ther Men's Actions, because, he says, *many things are done* κατ' οἰκονομίαν *by way of Oeconomy or prudent Conduct* *. Epictetus had mention'd the same thing before him, reckoning among other different methods of acting, one in particular, κατ' οἰκονομίαν^m. Τῷ περὶ τοῦ μέν τὰ μὲν θεωρητικῶς πράττονται, τὰ δὲ κατ' οἰκονομίαν, τὰ δὲ κατ' οἰκονομίαν, τὰ δὲ κατ' οἰκονομίαν, τὰ δὲ κατ' οἰκονομίαν, τὰ δὲ κατ' οἰκονομίαν. The nature of the Stoical οἰκονομία was this, that however rigid, severe, and exact the σοφὸς among them was in Theory, yet he might act in the common affairs of Life with some Latitude by way of Accommodation. Thus as to Riches and Honour, and all the *externa bona* of Life, tho' the Stoick could never esteem them as ἀγαθὰ in abstract Speculation, yet he might use and pursue them as such κατ' οἰκονομίαν and συμπεριφορὰν. Lactantius says of themⁿ. *Faciet & quæ non probabit, ut etiam ad majora transitum inveniat; nec relinquet bonos mores, sed tempori se aptabit, ut quibus alii utuntur in gloriam aut voluptatem, utatur agendæ rei causâ.* I believe indeed, that the Stoick sometimes indulg'd his οἰκονομία too far, but then it was a vicious abuse of it, not allow'd by the rules of Stoicism, nor practis'd by the true conscientious Professors of it. It was only to extend to things indifferent and innocent in themselves,

* Lib. 11. §. 18.

m Arrian. Lib. 3. Cap. 14.

n Lib. 3. Inst. Cap. 15.

without the least violation of Virtue, in order to prevent any popular odium and aversion to their Sect. *Hic mihi modus placet*, says *Seneca*°, *temperetur Vita inter bonos mores & publicos*. As if he had said, adapt and suit your Behaviour to the taste and practice of the World, as far as Morality and Virtue will permit, neither offending on one side by too much preciseness and rigour, nor on the other by too indulgent compliances.

AGAIN, the Fathers sometimes say of their own and others Writings, that several things are deliver'd in them *οἰκονομικῶς* and *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, that is, in our Author's Translation, by way of *Oeconomy* or *Dispensation*. This it seems is the pretty obnoxious Phrase, which falling from the Pens of the Fathers with too little caution and reserve, discovers at once all their Plots and Intrigues, and proves a manifest *αὐτοπρωεία* upon them. *Sorex in alicio suo perit miser!* But alas! Their Plots and Intrigues are nothing but Dream and Imagination, and the venerable Sages suffer in their Character as Cheats, for no other reason, but because they are not understood. Whenever they apply *οἰκονομικῶς* and *κατ' οἰκονομίαν* to their own Actions or Writings, they do not extend this *Oeconomy* to a wild and unbounded liberty of neglecting Truth, and of doing or saying any

thing that *might serve to gain the Victory*. This would have been a flat contradiction to their constant Practice and Profession, would have rendred their Cause and Themselves contemptible to all their Advertaries, and rais'd the Clamours, Invective, and Censure of all around them. Now where do we hear of such Evasions, Prevarications, and Subterfuges objected to them by their Enemies and Antagonists? Which yet on the other supposition could not possibly be avoided. The truth of the matter is this. They were Men too *good* to offer at Quirks and Illusions of this kind, and too *wise* thus to hazard and discredit their Cause, by giving their Enemies such apparent Advantages. The grand *οἰκονομία* which they were not ashamed to acknowledge, was very consistent both with Truth and Prudence. It was really nothing more (in their writings) than a strong and vigorous application to their Adversaries in Terms and Expressions very bold, pathetick, and striking, tho' perhaps not so innocent and accurate as they themselves would use when out of a Dispute. But still tho' they did not confine themselves in the heat of dispute to Expressions exact and unexceptionable, they did to Truth and Consistency. They *did not say one thing and mean the contrary*, as our Author suggests, but spoke agreeably always to their known and profess'd Sentiments, only in such words as suited the present occasion

sion best, and by suiting it best gave room for what they neither design'd or desir'd, misconstruction and misapplication. So in the case of *Dionysius* the great Bishop of *Alexandria*. There were some, it seems, at *Pentapolis*, a City of the upper *Lybia*, who preach'd and propagated industriously the *Sabellian* Heresy, denying a distinct Subsistence and Personality of the Son from the Father in the Holy Trinity. To these pernicious Opinions and Doctrines *Dionysius* immediately makes a zealous and vigorous opposition, and writes an Epistle upon this Occasion and Subject to *Ammonius* and *Euphranor*, wherein, pursuing his Argument against the *Sabellians*, and evincing from many passages of the New Testament the Divine Personality of the Son, as *Tertullian* had done before him against *Praxeas*, he drop'd some Expressions which seem'd to favour the *Arian* Positions, and which therefore were quoted by them against the Catholicks with a great deal of Confidence and Triumph. In answer to which pretences, *Athanasius* considers and defends *Dionysius's* Doctrine, as purely Catholick and opposite to *Arianism*. This he shews from several Epistles of *Dionysius* himself, which he wrote on purpose to clear himself from any such Heretical Imputation. And as to those particular Expressions of his, insisted on by *Arians*, *Athanasius* contends very justly for their being interpreted as spoken

κατ' οἰκονομίαν, that is, as the Controversy then on foot necessitated him to speak, in order to confute and silence his *Sabellian* Adversaries, but still within the verge of Honesty and Catholicism. As for instance, to shew that the Son was a Person distinct from the Father, *Dionysius* urges some Characters of both in the New Testament, particularly one in St. *John*, that the Father is there call'd the Husbandman, and the Son the Vine, from whence he argu'd that the Son must be ἀλλότριος καὶ ὅτιαν τῷ Πατρὶ of a different ὕπα from the Father. This was an Expression of *Dionysius* which gave some offence to the Catholics, and umbrage and boldness to the *Arians*. They immediately look'd upon the Bishop as a Patron of their ἐπεροῦστος and ἀνόμιος, without considering the scope and meaning of the word ὕπα in the Bishop's Epistle. The Bishop's design and aim was by this Expression, either to prove a distinct *Subsistence* of the Son from the Father, tho' in one and the same Divine Nature, or else a different *Substance* in the Son, but in reference to his Human οἰκονομία or Incarnation. Either of which Interpretations the Greek word ὕπα was very capable of, according to Ecclesiastical use. Therefore *Athanasius* with very good reason disputes the claim of the *Arians* to *Dionysius*, which was founded only on a misinterpretation of his words, and refers them for a right
 expli-

explication of the Bishop, to the οἰκονομία and his other Epistles P.

AGAIN, instead of the word οἰκονομικῶς they us'd sometimes the words ἀγωνιστικῶς and γυμναστικῶς to express the same thing. So St. Basil says of the famous Gregory of Neocæsarea, that the Sabellians in those Parts put wrong Constructions and Interpretations on several Passages in that great Writer, as not considering or understanding that those Passages of Gregory, were and ought to be Interpreted as spoken, ἀγωνιστικῶς, that is, with reference to the Subject and Dispute in hand. So St. Je-

ρ Εἰς Πεντηπόλει τῆς αἰῶς Λιθύς, τηλικαῦτά τις τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν ἰφρό-
τησαν τῇ Σαβελλίῳ· καὶ τοσούτοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἐπιστολαὶ ὡς ὀλίγαι δέιν μοι
αἰεὶ εἶναι ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις κηρύττειν τὴν ἡγὺν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τὴν μεγάλαν Διόνυ-
σιον· ——— πέμπει καὶ συμβουλεύει τοῖς αἰτίοις παύσασθαι τῆς κακηγορίας
ὡς δὲ σὺ ἐπαύνητο, ἀλλὰ ἐμᾶλλον ἀναιδέστερον ἡσέβουν, ἡσυχάζοντες πρὸς
τὴν ἀναιδέειαν ἐκείνην γράψαι τὴν τοιαύτην ἐπιστολήν· καὶ τῇ ἀνδραπνίᾳ τοῦ
Σωτῆρος· ὅτι ἡ ἐκκλησία περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὡς ἐπειδὴ τοιμηρότεροι ἐκείνοι τὸν
ἡγὺν ἠρεοῦντο, καὶ τῇ ἀνδραπνίᾳ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀντιτίθισιν, οὕτως οὐ-
τὸν διέχευε, ὅτι σὺ ὁ Πατὴρ, ἀλλ' ὁ υἱός ἐστι ὁ γινόμενος· ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
ἀνδραπνῶν, πίστις τοῦς ἀμαρτάνους μὴ εἶναι τὸν Πατέρα υἱόν. Καὶ οὕτως
λοιπὸν κατ' ὀλίγον ἐκείνου· εἰς τὴν ἀληθινὴν ἀναγνώγῃ γνώσει τοῦ υἱοῦ,
καὶ τὴν γνώσει τῇ περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς. Αὕτη τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἡ ὑπόθεσις· καὶ διὰ
ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν, οὕτως ἔγραψα καὶ αὐτὸς, διὰ τοῦς θελήσαντας οὕτως
ἐκκαυχόντας μεταθεῖναι τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας πίστιν. Τί τοίνυν ὅμοιος ἡ Ἀρείου
αἵρεσις καὶ ἡ Διονύσιου διάνοια; ἡ Ἀρετὴ Διονύσιον· ὡς Ἀρείος ὀνομάζεται,
πολλῆς οὐδὲς αὐτῶν τῆς διαφορᾶς; ——— Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτῶν
γινώσκουσιν, μὴ ἐκείτωσαν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, οὐ γὰρ ἀξιοπρέπειας κατὰ τοῦτο·
εἰ δὲ γράψας τὴν πρὸς Ἀρμενίων ἐπιστολὴν ὑπεβλήθη καὶ ἀπλολογήσασθαι
ΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΩΝ ΤΑ ΠΡΩΤΑ, ΑΠΟΛΟΓΗΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΕ ΟΥ ΜΕΤΑ-
ΒΕΒΑΗΤΑΙ, δηλὸν ἂν εἴη ὅτι καὶ τῇ ὑποβλήντῃ κατ' ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ
ἔγραψεν· οὐ δὲ δὲ καὶ κατ' ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ γραφόμενα, καὶ γινόμενα,
ταῦτα κακοτρόπως διέχευε, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ἔλκειν ἑκαστὸν βούλησιν.
Athanaf. Sentent. Dionysii. q Epist. 64.

rom says^r, *Aliud esse γυμνασικῶς scribere, aliud δογματικῶς*. Not that either *Basil* or *Ferom* allow'd of Falshood and Selfcontradiction in this or any other case; but the whole and truth of their meaning is, that peculiar ways of Expression and Acting are necessary to Dispute and Controversy; which would not be proper for a cool and elaborate Discourse.

WELL, but *St. Ferom* is call'd in as Evidence to this sort of Fraud and Prevarication, not only in himself but many other *Holy Fathers*^r. *Origen, Methodius, Eusebius, Apollinarius*, (says *St. Ferom*) have writ largely against *Celsus* and *Porphyrus*; Do but observe, says he, the manner of their arguing, and what slippery Problems they us'd. They alledg'd against the Gentiles, not what they believ'd, but what they thought necessary. *Non quod sentiunt, sed quod necesse est dicunt*. And adds, I forbear mentioning the *Latin Writers*, as *Tertullian, Cyprian, Minutius, Victorinus, Lactantius, and Hilary*; lest I should seem rather to accuse others than defend my self. So then, now all is out. *St. Ferom* with the rest of his Christian Brethren is manifestly αὐτοκράτειος; no further room left for Plea and Apology, but Sentence and Execution must pass upon them without benefit o' Clergy. However we'll hope at least for better things;

^r Apolog. ad Pamm. pro Lib. adv. Jovin.

^f Christianity as old &c. p. 142.

perhaps there may something be still remaining to soften and palliate, some saving Clause or Exception may luckily occur to shift and alleviate the Charge. St. *Ferom*, you say, acknowledges this of himself and other Fathers. He does so. But does he not here alledge the same thing against *Christ* and St. *Paul*? Yes, by our Author's Confession. For he goes on charging, not only St. *Paul*, but even *Jesus Christ* himself with the same practice. Then pray, let me ask our Author one Question. Can he, or any Man whatever of common Sense, imagine that St. *Ferom* would here insinuate of *Jesus Christ* and St. *Paul*, that they did not think themselves oblig'd to speak the truth, but that every thing was lawful, which serv'd to gain the Victory. If our Author can believe this, I am sure he must never assume the Title of *Free-thinker*. If he cannot, then what St. *Ferom* says here of himself and the Fathers, must certainly be allow'd to have an innocent meaning, such a one as is perfectly consistent with St. *Ferom*'s opinion of *Christ* and St. *Paul*. What that particular meaning is, I'll venture to open and explain, and shall leave it with our penetrating Author to be examin'd and confuted at leisure. St. *Ferom* had been engag'd in dispute with one *Jovinian* on several Points, one of which related to Matrimony. *Jovinian* asserted, that a single or married Life made no difference of Merit in Persons equal

in other respects. St. *Jerom* opposes this position as contrary to the general Doctrine of the Christian Church, and the Scriptures. He spends one whole Book out of two on this Subject, and after its Publication hearing that some few Expressions and Passages in it had given offence, as being too severe and reflecting on the Marriage State, he writes a most elegant Defence of it to his learned Friend *Pammachius*, telling him his great surprize to find Men of Learning and a liberal Education such injudicious Interpreters. He wonders that they do not consider and allow for Occasions and Circumstances, which of course must require a suitable variety and turn in Expression. A Man in dispute, as he was, could not possibly talk in that clear and exact way which a Preacher or Catechist would use, but must of necessity take some Latitude, must put himself in various postures of Defence, must watch opportunities of striking and disarming his Adversary with abundance of art, caution, and dexterity. But still, tho' his words and expressions bore occasional Latitudes and Peculiarities, yet his Truth and Honesty and Consistency were sufficiently secur'd, and no Prevarications were admitted in order to gain a Victory. He farther justifies his way of managing the Dispute by appealing not only to Orators, as *Demosthenes* and *Cicero*, but to *Plato*, *Theophrastus*, *Xenophon*, and *Aristotle*; and not
only

only to these but to Christian Writers, such as *Origen*, *Methodius*, *Eusebius*, *Apollinaris* among the Greeks, and to *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Minutius*, *Victorinus*, *Lactantius*, and *Hilary* among the *Latins*^t, which if our Author will endeavour to prove as fraudulent as he would represent them, I'll promise to vindicate as to any particulars which shall be alledg'd. In the

t Debuerat prudens & benignus Lector, etiam ea quæ videntur dura, æstimare de cæteris: & non in uno atque eodem libro, criminari me diversas sententias protulisse. Quis enim tam hebes, & sic in scribendo rudis est, ut idem laudet & damnet? ædificata destruat, & destructa ædificet? & quum adversarium vicerit, suo novissimè mucrone feriatur? Si rustici homines, & vel rhetoricæ, vel dialecticæ artis ignari detraherent mihi, tribuerem veniam imperitiæ: nec accusationem reprehenderem, ubi non voluntatem in culpâ cernerem, sed ignorantiam. Nunc verò quum disertis homines, & liberalibus studiis eruditi, magis velint lædere, quàm intelligere, breviter à me RESPONSUM HABEANT, corrigere eos debere peccata, non reprehendere. Patet campus, stat è contra acies, adversarii dogma manifestum est: & “(ut Virgilianum aliquid inferam) “illum aspice contra, Qui vocat: Respondeant adversario. Aliter teneant modum in disputando, aliter virgam in docendo; & me in libris suis, quid vel prætermiserim vel addiderim, doceant. Reprehensores non audio, sequor magistros. Delicata doctrina est, pugnanti ictus dictare de muro: ET QUUM IPSE unguentis delibutus sis, cruentum militem accusare formidinis. Nec hoc dicens, statim jactantiæ reus sum, quòd cæteris dormientibus solus certaverim. Sed hoc dico, cautius eos posse pugnare, qui me viderint vulneratum. Nolo tale certamen ad eas, in quo tantum te protegas: & torpente dextrâ, sinistrâ clypeum circumferas. Aut ferendum tibi est, aut cadendum. Non possum te æstimare victorem, nisi adversariam videro trucidatum.

Legimus, eruditissime vir, in scholis pariter; & Aristotelea illa vel de Gorgiæ fontibus manantia, simul didicimus, plura esse videlicet genera dicendi: & inter cætera, aliud esse *ὑποθετικὴν* scribere; aliud *ἀποφαντικὴν*. In priori vagari esse disputationem; & adversario respondentem, nunc hæc, nunc illa

mean time, to prevent sinister suspicions and

proponere: Argumentari ut libet, aliud loqui, aliud agere; panem, ut dicitur, ostendere; lapidem tenere. In sequenti autem aperta frons; & ut ita dicam, ingenuitas necessaria est. Aliud est quærere, aliud definire: In altero pugnandum: in altero docendum est. Tu me stantem in prælio, & de vitâ periclitantem studiosus magister doceas; *Noli ex obliquo, & unde non putaris, vulnus inferre. Directo percutere gladio. Turpe tibi est hostem dolis ferire, non viribus.* Quasi non & hæc arsumma pugnantium sit, alibi minari, alibi percutere. Legite, obsecro vos, Demosthenem: legite Tullium: ac ne forsitan Rhetores vobis displiceant (quorum artis est, verisimilia magis quam vera dicere) legite Platonem, Theophrastum, Xenophontem, Aristotelem, & reliquos qui de Socratis fonte manantes, diversis cucurrere rivulis: quid in illis apertum, quid simplex est? Quæ verba non sensuum? Qui sensus non victoriæ? Origines, Methodius, Eusebius, Apollinaris, multis versuum millibus scribunt adversus Celsum & Porphyrium. Considerate quibus argumentis, & quam lubricis problematibus, diaboli spiritu contexta subvertant: Et quia *interdum coguntur* loqui, non quod sentiunt; sed quod necesse est, dicunt adversus eos qui dicuntur esse Gentiles. Taceo de Latinis Scriptoribus, Tertulliano, Cypriano, Minutio, Victorino, Lactantio, Hilario, ne non tam me defendisse, quam alios videar accusasse. Paulum Apostolum proferam, quem quotiescumque lego, videor mihi non verba audire, sed tonitrua. Legite Epistolas ejus, & maxime ad Romanos, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, in quibus totus in certamine positus est; & videbitis eum in testimoniis quæ sumit de veteri Testamento, quam artifex, quam prudens, quam dissimulatus sit ejus quod agit. Videntur quædam verba simplicia, & quasi innocentis hominis ac rustici; & qui facere nec declinare noverit insidias: sed quoque respexeris, fulmina sunt. Hæret in causâ, capit omne quod tetigerit: tergum vertit, ut superet: fugam simulat, ut occidat. Calumniemur ergo illum, atque dicamus ei: Testimonia quibus contra Judæos vel cæteras hæreses usus es, aliter in suis locis, aliter in tuis Epistolis sonant. Videmus exempla captiva, servierunt tibi ad victoriam, quæ suis in voluminibus non dimicant. Nonne nobis loquitur cum Salvatore; aliter foris, aliter domi loquimur? Turbæ parabolas, discipuli audiunt veritatem. Proponit Phariseis Dominus quæstiones, & non edisserit. Aliud est docere discipulum, aliud adversarium vincere. Hieron. Apolog. pro Lib. adv. Jovinian. ad Pammach. Ed. Bened.

preju-

prejudices, let us go on farther with *Jerom*, selecting the most obnoxious Expressions, and seeing whether all that Fraud and Iniquity is intimated by them, which our Author out of pure good Nature and Charity suggests. *Non quod sentiunt; sed quod necesse est dicunt*. In our Author's Translation, *they alledg'd against the Gentiles, not what they believ'd, but what they thought necessary*. You observe our Author is railing here against Fraud and Insincerity, and yet *dispenses* with both in himself, in extracting this very passage of *St. Jerom*. For the Text of the Father is really this. *Interdum coguntur loqui non quod sentiunt: sed quod necesse est; dicunt adversus eos qui dicuntur esse Gentiles*. They are forc'd sometimes not to speak what they think; but they say what is necessary (in those circumstances) against those who are call'd Gentiles. The words *interdum* and *coguntur* our Author industriously drops, that the Fathers may be thought *always* to speak on these occasions *not what they believe*, and without any sort of *Force*, but by inclination and choice. This is not the first time that poor *St. Jerom* has been mangled and misrepresented; the *Discourse on Freethinking*, some years ago, fell under the sharp rebuke of *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis* ^u on this very account. But now behold the Construction and Inference. *The holy Fathers did not think themselves oblig'd to speak the Truth;*

^u Part. II. p. 10. Ed. 6.

they

they thought by Oeconomy they might say one thing and mean the contrary. The stinging Reflection of this Sentence upon the Fathers, is plainly this, that they did not always *Speak the Truth*, or their own Sentiments of things. He makes no allowance, you see, for the several ways of *not speaking the Truth* and *their own Sentiments*, and therefore unless the Reflection was design'd to be dull, insipid, and impertinent, he must make no distinction between them in Crime and Exception, and ground it on these very wise and judicious Principles. 1st. That on no occasion you must say one thing and mean another. 2^d. That at all times, and in all places, and to all Persons you must *Speak the Truth*. *En cor Zenodoti! en jecur Cratetis!* So that according to principle the first; those fine Oratorical Tropes, *Allegories*, *Ironies*, and *Hyperbolies* must all be banish'd as wicked and abominable; for Allegory has its name, *quia* ^w ἄλλο μὲν ἀγορεύει, ἄλλο δὲ νόει, *says one thing and means another*. Irony, ^x *cum per id quod dicimus, contrarium significamus*, *when we speak one thing, and signify the contrary*. And an Hyperbole, *quia* ^y *nempe veritatis limites excedimus*, *because we exceed the bounds of Truth (in it.)* For the same reason, thousands of Proverbs, not excepting the Scrip-

^w Vossi Institut. Orat. Lib. 4. Cap. 11.

^x Ibid. Cap. 9.

^y Ibid. Cap. 12. §. 9.

tural, the Fables of *Esop*, *Phædrus*, *Avienus*, must all be abhorr'd and decry'd as sinful and fraudulent. These perhaps will be said to be wild and Romantick Consequences, yet wild as they are, they are such as my Author's ambiguous and indeterminate Phrases will bear; and sure I may take the liberty of drawing out such on one side, when he has been pleas'd to be as wild and Romantick in his on the other. Now for principle the second. According to this, no Arguments may ever be us'd by Disputants *ad Hominem*, that is, in Mr. *Locke's* words, *to press a Man with Consequences drawn from his own Principles and Concessions*. Because here they do not speak their own inward Sentiments, *sed quod necesse est*, what the nature and circumstances of Dispute oblige them to. According to this, we may never dissemble, disguise our thoughts, nor use any fictions to Children, Madmen, Impertinents, and Enemies, and in short, on no occasion, under no sort of Circumstances, and to no Persons whatever, may we venture to practise any Feints, Reserves, or Ambiguities in words or actions. Which yet is fully prov'd, not only to be lawful, but commendable in many Cases, by *Grotius*^z, *Puffendorf*^a, and *Barbeyrac*^b. And what is still more surprizing, our Author

^z Jur. Bell. & Pac. Lib. 3. Cap. 11.

^a Lib. 4. Cap. 1.

^b Not. in Puffend.

himself, in another part of his Book, allows and contends for the same thing. "Tho' Speech, says he, was given Men to communicate their thoughts, and 'tis generally for their common good, that Men *should speak as they think*, yet this common good prescribes *certain Restrictions*. Deceiving an Enemy in a just War either by words or actions, if it tends to bring about the end of the War, is certainly a Duty; and the same Reason obliges People not to keep those Promises, tho' sworn to, which they have been forc'd to make to Robbers and Thieves. — Friendship will sometimes oblige Men to deceive People, when it manifestly tends to their good, and none are prejudic'd by it; and all practice it with relation to Children, Sick People, and Men in passion. Must he not be an ill Man indeed, who would not save an innocent Person, by *telling* his Pursuer a *falsehood*? This is a Duty he owes to both the Pursuer and Pursued. And if Men (as none scruple it) may bid their Servants say they are not at home, why may they not, when silence will be interpreted to their prejudice, deceive impertinent People, in such matters where they have no concern?

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

c Chap. 13.

So that it seems the whole *Oeconomy* of the Fathers, as here represented, may at last amount to no higher breach of Truth and Equity, than what is easily justified from common establish'd rules of Rhetorick, Logick, and Ethicks; and now the Objector is just where he first begun, he has not advanc'd one step in the proof of his Charge against the Fathers, and may e'en perplex and rack his invention for *extraneous* evidence of their *Fraud*, since he finds their *Confessions* will prove nothing criminal against them.

II.

AND *there was nothing so sacred, that could escape being chang'd either in whole or in part*^d. Very severe, sarcastical, and comprehensive truly! Nothing excepted from change and corruption, tho' ever so sacred! 'Tis well for us Christians that the Charge is deliver'd in generals, otherwise perhaps it might have made some ill impression on the Reader, and the *Priest* have been put to the difficult task of a particular Answer. But, pray, let the Reader observe in this place, the sudden transiion and artful variation in style. He says not a word of particular *Fathers* concern'd in this and the following Forgeries. And yet the connexion of this and the Sentence preceding requires

^d Christianity as old &c. p. 142. Ed. 8vo.

that what is alledg'd, should at least be understood of no other Persons but the *Fathers*. So that the latent Scheme and Artifice here is to cheat and delude the Reader by a fly *Innuendo*, without directly hazarding his own veracity and credit.

WELL, but to make good this general Charge, some particular instances of Forgery are alledg'd. *Even the Canons of the famous Council of Nice, as well as the Canons of other Councils have been falsify'd.* Surprizing and pertinent Discovery! Our Author brings nothing either new or *de proprio* but Inference and Application. The thing and story it self has been known for many Years, but he is the first that attempts to prove a *general* corruption from *particular* Instances, and throws the fault of all upon the *Holy Fathers*. Allowing some few Canons of Councils to be falsify'd. I ask him, by whom were they falsify'd? Not by the *Fathers*. *Daille* himself does not offer to charge *them* with this, tho' he is the Man that furnishes our Author with all these materials. He tells us from *Sirmond* the Jesuit that the 44th Canon of the 4th Council of *Carthage* in 398 was falsify'd. But by whom? By *Gratian* a Monk and Canonist of the 12th Century in his Book of *Decretals*^e. Again, he

^e Canon erat Concilii Carthaginensis quarti. Clericus ne comam nutriat, nec barbam radat. Hic Canon in *Decretalibus* sic muti-

says that the 2d Canon of the 1st Council of Orange was falsify'd. By whom? By the same Gratian^f. The same Information does he give us of several other Canons^g; that Gratian had taken the liberty to alter their genuine form, and to suit them to the Principles and Pra-

*mutilatus recitatur; Si quis ex clericis comam relaxaverit, anathe-
ma sit. Cur? Quia nimirum (inquit Sirmondus) Postquam contra
canonem radi à clericis barba capit, canonem qui vetaret, extare
non placuit. Dallæus de Usu Patr. Cap. 4.*

*f Canon erat (eodem quoque Sirmondo ex Manuscriptis Libris
auctore) Arausicanæ 1. Synodi, negans chrisma semel in Bap-
tismo acceptum repeti postea necesse esse. Gratianus Canonem sic
effingit, ac si planè contrà affirmaret Chrismatis repetitionem
esse necessariam.*

*g Canon erat Trullanus xxxvi. Renovantes, quæ à CL Patri-
bus in hac à Deo conservandæ & regiâ urbe, &c. constituta sunt,
DECERNIMUS, ut thronus CPus aqualia privilegia cum antiqua
Roma throno obtineat, & in Ecclesiasticis, ut ille, rebus, magnifiat,
ut qui sit secundus post illum. Et hunc quoque Solertissimus
Gratianus ad sui sæculi gustum ita temperavit; Renovantes (in-
quit) Sancti CP. decreta Concilii, PETIMUS, ut CP Sedes simi-
lia privilegia, quæ superior Roma habet, accipiat; NON TAMEN
in Ecclesiasticis rebus magnificetur, ut illa; Sed hac secunda post
illam existens prius quam Alexandrina sedes numeretur. Liqueat
Gratianum JURE illo suo (quod ei tribuit Sirmondus) hîc quo-
que usum esse; jure scilicet quidvis pro re Romanâ mentiendi
fingendique: quo & alibi usus est non semel: ut cum canonem
Synodi Carthag. IV. simpliciter vetantem, ne mulier, quamvis
docta, aliquos baptizare præsumat: ipse ne suos pulsaret, qui mu-
lieri, etiam indoctæ, baptizandi jus in necessitate concedunt, ad-
hibita exceptione ita callidè diluit; Mulier, quamvis docta &
sancta, viros in conventu docere, vel aliquos baptizare non præ-
sumat, NISI necessitate cogente. Eandem artem alibi in mollien-
do Milevitanorum Patrum canone adhibet, quum quod illi olim
simpliciter & absolute decreverant, excommunicandos quicumque
trans mare appellassent, ipse cum exceptione sic recitat; Ad
transmarina autem, qui putaverit appellandum, à nullo intra A-
fricam in communionem suscipiatur, NISI forte Romanam sedem ap-
pellaverit. Plura alia sunt exempla,*

Nice of the Church of *Rome* in his own time. But not one single Instance of *such falsification* does he ever produce in the *Holy Fathers*.

As to the Canons of the Council of *Nice* in particular, I assure him not only that they suffer'd no *falsification* from the *Holy Fathers*, but that by many of them they were very industriously preserv'd and vindicated from it. A whole Council of Bishops at *Carthage* A. D. 419^h. made a strict search and inquiry for authentick Copies of those very Canons, and receiv'd them from *Constantinople* and *Alexandria* with Epistles from *Atticus* and *Cyril* presiding at that time in those great Seesⁱ. Besides these *Rufinus*^k, *Theodore*^l, *Gelasius Cyzicenus*^m, and the Versions of *Dionysius*, and *Isidore* mention and represent no other Canons of *Nice* than those which are truly genuine.

THEN he goes on. *And those forg'd Canons of Nice the Popes for many Ages impos'd on the Christian World as genuine*. It's plain from hence that our wise Author knows little or nothing about the *forg'd* Canons. The *forg'd* Canons of *Nice* properly so call'd were not so much

^h Council. Harduin. Tom. 1. p. 1244.

ⁱ Ibid. p. 944. 945. Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Tom. 11. Lib.

6. cap. 4. p. 366.

^k Hist. Eccl. Lib. 11. cap. 7.

^l Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. cap. 8.

^m Act. Conc. Nicen. Lib. 2. cap. 31.

as heard of in *Europe* before the Year 1560, and some Years after that in Pope *Pius* the 4th's time *Baptista* a Jesuit brought them to *Rome* from *Alexandria*, and from his *Arabick* Manuscript *Pisanus* publish'd them in Latin first; after him with additional ones *Franciscus Turrianus*, and in the Year 1645 *Abraham Ecchellensis* publish'd them and many other spurious Constitutions of *Nice* in a Latin Translation likewise. Lastly, in the Year 1672. our excellent and learned Bp. *Beveridge* gave us an account and Translation of *Josephus Ægyptius's* Arabick Version and Paraphrase of the same Canons, with very curious Annotations upon them. This is the true and authentick Historyⁿ of the *forg'd* Canons, which are said to have been impos'd for many Ages by the Popes on the Christian World,

BUT to be fair and ingenuous with my Author, there is, I allow, an old Story of the *Nicene* Canons, which it is not impossible for him to allude to, tho' with much confusion and error; which is this. ° In the Year 418, *Zosimus* Bishop of *Rome* on occasion of a late Appeal of one *Apiarius* an *African* Presbyter to him, sent *Faustinus* a Bishop, and *Philippus* and

ⁿ Job. Ludolph. Hist. Æthiop. Lib. 3. cap. 4. N°. 29. Bever. ad Pandect. Can. p. 211. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. Tom. 11. Lib. 6. cap. 4. p. 364.

° Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. ap. Harduin. Conc. Tom. 1. p. 941. Cave Hist. Litter. Vol. 2. p. 155. Buddei Isagog. p. 893.

Asellus two Presbyters as his Legates, with a *Commonitorium* or Mandate to the *African* Council assembled at that time in *Carthage*. Among other particulars of this *Commonitorium*, there was one in the highest degree offensive to the *African* Bishops, concerning Appeals from all other Provinces to the Bishop of *Rome*. *Zosimus* alledg'd for this extraordinary Prerogative of the *Roman* See the Canons of *Nice*, which afterwards prov'd to be not the Canons of *Nice* but of *Sardica*. This is the Story, which it is not impossible, I say, for our Author to allude to, when he charges the Canons of *Nice* with falsification, and the Popes of *Rome* with imposing them on the Christian World for many Ages. I am the more inclin'd to think this was his meaning, because *Daillé* has taken particular notice of it to the same purpose, tho' with much more exactness and propriety.

BUT to cut off any pretence or retreat of this kind, I will lay open this affair without any gloss or disguise. It is then an indisputable fact indeed, that *Zosimus* did alledge to the *African* Bishops the Canons of *Sardica* under the Name and Title of *Nicene*. But 1st. I cannot understand, by what propriety of Speech *Zosimus* can be said on this account to falsify the famous Canons of *Nice*. To falsify is certainly to alter, corrupt, and disfigure the

Canons, with respect to Substance and Form. Now nothing like this is committed by *Zosimus* either in *Nicene* or *Sardican* Canons. They both continued just as they were from the beginning, without being either enlarg'd or diminish'd. Therefore the most that *Zosimus* ought to be charg'd with is a Misquotation with regard to title, common to numberless Writers Antient and Modern, by accidental mistake. 2d. There is no sort of proof or evidence from History, that *Zosimus* cited them in this manner with design to impose upon others. The contrary seems very clear, that *Zosimus* himself was led into an error by the Collection of Canons then publish'd and receiv'd at *Rome*. In the Year 1675. *Paschasius Quesnel* produc'd in a large Appendix to the Works of *Leo* the Great, an old Collection of *Roman* Canons superior in Antiquity to that of *Dionysius Exiguus*, which contains the *Nicene* and *Sardican* Canons joyn'd together without distinction, making the whole number 46. The Title at the head in the MSS. is, *Canones Nicani Concilii sub titulis 46*. This Collection of Canons *Quesnel* in a learned Dissertation upon it^q shews was that which Pope *Innocent*

^q Afferimus non alios canones à Romanâ Ecclesiâ Innocentii ætate susceptos, suoque habuisse insertos Codici, quàm qui vel *Nicani* reverà erant, vel *pro Nicanis habebantur*, eisque ac-
tusebantur à Romanis, eo modo quo in nostro codice repræ-
sentantur. *Quesnel*. Dissertat. 12. Cap. 2.

Facile igitur in eam sententiam inclino, Romanum Codicem
à *Nica-*

and *Zosimus* made use of; and from hence he accounts for the false quotations of the *Nicene* and *Sardican* Canons by those two Bishops of *Rome*. *Quesnel's* Hypothesis and Arguments have had so much weight in the learned World, that *Fabricius*^r does not scruple to acquiesce

à *Nicana Sardicensisque* Synodorum temporibus ad usque *Innocentii* *Zosimique* ætatem, nullos alios Canones regulasque Ecclesiasticas complexum esse præter *Nicæni* *Sardicensisque* Concilii Canones; neque *Sardicenses* in illo locum habuisse, nisi quia pro *Nicanis* habiti sunt, eorumque nomine vestiti, ac eis sine ullâ distinctione subjuncti. Id. Ibid.

Ex pluribus priscorum Romæ Episcoporum Epistolis, atque ex Canonibus in *Africam* à *Zosimo* Papa missis sub *Nicænorum* Canonum nomine, quamvis *Sardicenses* eos fuisse jam in confesso sit, certum penè hætenus fuit apud eruditos, Romanam Ecclesiam utriusque concilii canones habuisse sibi invicem vel immixtos vel subjectos sine ullâ distinctionis inter utrosque notâ; cumque novatores *Zosimo* affectati mendacii ac meditatæ impostura crimen procacibus verbis impingere præsumperunt, nihil melius nostri habuere, quam ut modesti faterentur pro *Nicænis* Canonibus *Sardicenses* ab illo habitos, & assererent id ex eo profectum, ut scribit *Marca*, quod eâ tempestate Canones *Nicæni* & *Sardicenses* in eodem volumine descripti essent nullo discrimine adhibito, sub titulo Canonum *Nicænorum*. Probabilis quidè conjectura, si vetusti codicis auctoritate niteretur, qui nondum emerfit è tenebris. — Sed nunc tandem codex integer prodit in lucem, ejusque ope probabilis Catholicorum Scriptorum conjectura in certum jam evadit Argumentum. Id. Cap. 4.

^r Superest, ut notitiam collectionum Latinarum, quam promissi, subjungam, atque ita capiti huic de Canonibus Ecclesiasticis finem imponam.

Pro antiquissimâ omnium habendus Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Romanæ, quem ex Codice duplici, Oxoniensi per *Edvardum Bernhardum* transmissio, ac *Thuanæo* primus vulgavit celeberrimus Vir *Paschasius Quesnellus* cum *Leonis Magni* operibus *Paris*. 1675. 4. & *Lugd.* 1700. fol. Hic nempe ipsi videtur codex, cujus ut antiquioris *Dionysius Exiguus* meminit, & cujus confusione testatur se impulsus, ut novam ipse Canonum editionem adornaret. In hoc Canon Viceſimus *Nicænus* prætermisſus,

in them, and *Buddeus* is very inclinable to do the same^f. So that we must not charge at random either *Innocent* or *Zosimus* with fraud, but the antient Collector of *Roman* Canons whoever he was, with confusion and negligence. The same Answer will serve to take off all *Daille's* objections against *Leo* the Great. He too like *Zosimus* his Predecessor, had quoted in an Epistle* to the Emperor *Theodosius*, a *Sardican* Canon for a *Nicene*, deceiv'd it is certain, in the same manner by his *Roman* Collection of Canons. And it is more than probable, that if *Daille* himself had liv'd to see, what the learned *Quesnel* has produc'd and argued on this Subject, he would not have

missis, & *Canones Sardicenses cum Nicenis ita permixti* extant, ut *Canones Nicenos* numeret 46, vel 47. ut in *Codice Atrebatensi*, vel, ut in *MS. Oxoniensi*, 48. Hinc *Sardicenses* pro *Nicenis* laudat *Innocentius* 1. (A. 416. defunctus) qui solos etiam *Nicenos* Canones à Romanâ Ecclesiâ receptos alibi testatur; pro *Sardicensi* vicissim *Nicenum* Canonem adduxit *Ferrandus Diaconus*; quâ de re, & quomodo *Codex* ille novis subinde incrementis sub *Innocentio*, *Zosimo*, *Celestino*, & *Leone Magno* fuerit auctus, & creverit in illam *Capp. 98.* magnitudinem, consulere juvabit laudatum *Quesnellum. Biblioth. Græc. Tom. 11. Lib. 6. cap. 1. p. 59, 60.*

f Jam ante *Dionysii* exigui versionem canonum Ecclesiæ Orientalis, novamque collectionem, quæ sæculo sexto prodiit, & de quâ deinceps dicemus, codicem quendam canonum in Ecclesiâ Romanâ receptum fuisse, positum hodiè apud Viros eruditissimos est extra controversiam. Imo *Codicem huncce antiquum* Ecclesiæ Romanæ ex tenebris tandem erutum in lucem protraxit, & cum *Leonis Magni* operibus edidit *Paschasius Quesnellus*, cujus & peculiaris de *Codice canonum Ecclesiæ Romanæ omnium*, qui hucusque prodierunt antiquissimo, nunc primum in lucem edito, extat *Dissertatio &c. Buddei Isagoge* p. 757, 758.

* *Epist. 40. Ed. Quesnel, & ap. Harduin. Conc. Tom. 2. p. 23, 26.*

wrote some things which now appear in his Book, nor have fill'd his head with so many suspicions and jealousies.

As to the imposing these or any other forg'd Canons of *Nice* on the Christian World for many Ages, 'tis nothing but Dream and Chimæra. This I have prov'd before of one sort of Canons, and the same is apparent with regard to the case before us. The *Sardican* Canons were not made till the Year 357, and in the Year 419, whatever cheat or imposture had pass'd about them, was all discover'd and set aside. Where now shall we reckon the many Ages of this reigning Imposture in the Christian World, between the Years 347 and 419? Besides it is plain, that the *Sardican* Canons were never impos'd at all for *Nicene* on the *Greek* or *African* Churches. The *African* Council tells *Boniface* Successor of *Zosimus* in 419. *Quamvis plurimos codices legeremus, nusquam in Nicæno Concilio in Latinis Codicibus legimus, quemadmodum in supradicto Commonitorio inde directa sunt.* Tho' we have read, say they, many Copies, yet do we no where find in the *Latin* (obtaining in *Africa*) Copies of the *Nicene* Council and its Canons, what is quoted and urg'd from thence in the *Commonitorium* mention'd above^t. From whence it is clear, that the *African* Bi-

^t Epist. Conc. Afric. ad Bonifacium ap. Harduin. Conc. Tom. 1. p. 943.

shops had always preserv'd the *Sardican* Canons distinct from those of *Nice*, and had never been persuaded by the Bishops of *Rome* to confound the one with the other. So in the East we find, that *Atticus** Bishop of *Constantinople* sent to the *African* Council a genuine Copy of the Canons of *Nice*, without intermixture of those of *Sardica*, and his Letter shews, that he had heard nothing of Papal Impositions in this respect. Neither was there any instance or foot-step of it in the *Western* Churches any farther than *Rome*. And *Quesnel* has spent a whole Chapter^u in the Dissertation mention'd above, to shew, that the Church of *Rome* had a Code or Book of Canons peculiar to it self, distinct from that of any other, which I do not find that the antient Popes attempted ever to impose upon other Churches. So that I leave the Reader to judge who is guilty of the greatest Imposition, the antient Popes of *Rome*, or our modern Deist.

III.

A 3^d Instance of Fraud Ecclesiastical, and Lay-Learning is this. *The antient Liturgies, tho' things of daily use, underwent divers alterations*^w. Profound and ingenious Sentence! The turn of which is so rational and just, that the very

* See above p. 36.

^u Dissertat. 12. Cap. 4.

^w Christianity as old &c. p. 142.

thing which is design'd to enforce and aggravate its charge, must serve to extenuate and spoil it. Alteration in Liturgies is a Crime (it seems) with our Author, the more heinous and unpardonable, because they are things of daily use; whereas on the contrary, for this very reason there is not any Crime or Forgery at all in it. It appears indeed sufficiently from *Goar*^x, *Mabillon*^y, *Le Nourry*^z, *Renaudot*^a, and others, that the antient Offices of Churches have not continued pure and free from additions and variations. But this does not prove any Fraud or Forgery in the case. Liturgies were fram'd at first by the Spiritual Governors of the Church, for the use and service of particular Churches, and this was a power which every Bishop of the Church was invested with, that is, no one Bishop or set of Bishops as such had any more Right or Authority to use it than another. Therefore, if any Publick Office had been introduc'd by any Bishop or Bishops at one time, this was not a necessary Form and Prescription to the Bishops of all succeeding Ages, but they by Episcopal Authority were still left at liberty to vary and improve at discretion, as occasions and exigencies should require. Thus we are told^b that

^x Eucholog Græc. p. 58. & seq.

^y Liturg. Gallican. Lib. 1. Cap. 2.

^z Appar. ad Biblioth. Max. Dissertat. 2 Ed. 1694.

^a Dissertat. de Liturg. Orient. Orig. & Auctor. Cap. 4.

^b Mabillon. Liturg. Gallic. Lib. 1. Cap. 2.

Gelasius Bishop of *Rome*, in the fifth Century, alter'd the *Roman* Liturgy which had been in Use before his time, and that *Gregory* after him, in the 6th Century, made Alterations in the Form of *Gelasius*. Yet did neither *Gelasius* nor *Gregory* incur any Charge of Forgery, because what they did, they did in the publick View, and for the Use of the Publick, and by a just and equal Authority. The Case is the same with respect to the *Greek* Church. Suppose that *Basil* or *Chrysostom* drew up and published Liturgical Forms for the Use of the *Greek* Churches, and that these Liturgical Forms in after Ages receiv'd Alterations from the Bishops their Successors. Where was the Fraud and Forgery in all this? Both *Basil* and *Chrysostom*, and all their Successors, acted equally in this Respect as Governors of the Church; and the Forms and Rituals of this kind are not to be consider'd as private Writings, but as publick Offices, to serve as general Rules to the Worship of whole Churches, and therefore obliged to submit to the Changes and Regulations of those who preside as Directors in those Churches. To bring the Case still nearer home. How many several Reviews and Corrections has the *English* Liturgy undergone from King *Edward* the VIth. to the present Time. And yet no Injury has been done to the first Compilers; nor can any just Censures and Reflections be cast upon their Successors on this

this Account. If indeed it should happen, that After-Alterations are of such a Nature as directly to corrupt the true Doctrine and Worship, and manifestly tend to it, then are they certainly culpable, and without Authority; and the Blame and ill Consequences of them must inevitably fall on the Governors who made them. But still, even these Alterations are not properly to be charged with Forgery and Fraud, but with Error or Superstition. These are Crimes very different, and easily separable from one another. The latter may proceed from want of Knowledge or Judgment, but the former from a bad and corrupt Disposition. I conclude this Head in the Words of the learned Mr. Bingham and Renaudot. The first says^e, *The very Liberty which every Bishop had to frame the Liturgy of his own Church, was one Reason why none of these are now remaining perfect and entire, as they were at first composed for the Use of such a particular Church. For the Design of them being only for the Use of such a particular Church, there was no great Reason to be very solicitous either to communicate and diffuse the Knowledge of them to other Churches, or to preserve them entire to Posterity, who were not precisely tied up to the Use of them, but might frame others at their own Discretion.* The latter makes this very just and wise Observation; *Publicis Ecclesi-*

c Antiq. Christ. Book 13. Chap. 5. Sect. 3.

arum

*arum officiis Sacramentalibus addita esse sequentibus
saeculis ea, quae omnium communi consensu inter sa-
cra recitabantur, interpolatio non est, sed ad u-
sum cujusque temporis accommodatio, publicâ
Autoritate, non privato cujuscunque consilio,
aut per fraudem facta^d.*

IV.

*Nay even the Creeds themselves, tho' thought
to be the sacred Depositum of the Faith, have
had the same fate^e. Here again we see the
same justness and propriety of thought, as in
the article above. The Creeds, as he says,
have had the same fate with the Liturgies in
alterations, and this is interpreted audacious
Presumption and Forgery, because they were
thought the sacred Depositum of the Faith.
What is the meaning of the sacred Depositum
of the Faith, is not easy to determine. How-
ever I guess, that this phrase is to signify, that
Creeds were thought to contain all the neces-
sary articles of Faith, and then the Iniquity
of altering the Creeds is to lie in altering and
varying the necessary Articles of Faith. This
is the only Sence of the words which I can
apprehend to be pertinent to our Author's pur-
pose, and therefore must take it for granted*

^d Differtat. de Liturg. Orient. Orig. & Autorit. Cap. 5.

^e Christianity as old &c. *ibid.*

in the present Remark. And as to the truth of what our Author advances under this Construction, it is all imaginary, groundless, and unwarrantable. The notion has been lately confuted by an excellent Writer of our own^f, and therefore I chuse to return my answer at present to it in his words and Arguments, as being perfectly clear, rational, and agreeable to Ecclesiastical Antiquity. “Creeds were
 “ never intended to contain, as it were, a
 “ *certain quantity* of Faith, as necessary to
 “ bring Men to Heaven, and no more than
 “ is necessary. Were this the case, all Creeds
 “ ought precisely to have consisted of an equal
 “ number of Articles, and the same indivi-
 “ dual Articles: whereas there are no two
 “ Creeds any where to be found which an-
 “ swer to such exactness. A plain Argument
 “ that the Church in forming of Creeds early
 “ and late went upon no such view, but up-
 “ on quite another principle. The design of
 “ all was, to keep up as strictly as possible
 “ the whole Compages or Fabrick of the
 “ Christian Faith as it stands in Scripture. And
 “ if any part came to be attack’d, they were
 “ then to bend all their cares to succour and
 “ relieve that part, in order still to secure the
 “ whole. Some few of the main *Stamina*, or
 “ chief lines were taken care of from the first,

^f Dr. Waterland's Critical History of the Athanasian Creed p. 285. &c. Edit. 2d.

“ and made up the first Creeds: particularly
 “ the Doctrine of the Trinity briefly hinted,
 “ and scarce any thing more, because the form
 “ of Baptism led to it. As to other *Articles*,
 “ or larger Explications of *This*. They came
 “ in occasionally, according as *This* or *That*
 “ part of the Christian Faith seem’d most to
 “ be endanger’d, and to require present Relief.
 “ And as *This* varied in several Countries, or
 “ Churches, (some being more disturbed than
 “ others, and some with one kind of Heresy,
 “ others with another) so the Creeds likewise
 “ varied; some insisting particularly upon *This*
 “ Article, others upon *That*, as need required,
 “ and all still endeavouring to keep up and
 “ maintain one whole and intire System of
 “ the Christian Faith, according to the true
 “ and full meaning of sacred Writ. There is
 “ nothing more in it than the very nature and
 “ circumstance of the Thing necessarily leads
 “ to. I may illustrate the case a little farther
 “ by an easy parallel between matters of *Faith*,
 “ and matters of *Practice*. The sum of Chri-
 “ stian Practice is contain’d in Two brief
 “ Rules, To love God, and to love one’s Neigh-
 “ bour; which comprehend all. No one needs
 “ more than *This*; nor indeed can there be any
 “ thing more. But then a perverse Man may
 “ possibly understand by God, not the true God,
 “ the God of *Jews* and *Christians*, but some
 “ other of his own devising, or such as has
 G “ been

“ been received by *Pagans*, or Hereticks : And
“ He may understand by *Neighbour* one of his
“ own *Country* only, or *Tribe*, or *Sect*, or *Fa-*
“ *mily*. Well then, to obviate any such me-
“ thod of undermining *Christian Practice*, it
“ will be necessary to be a little more *parti-*
“ *cular* than barely to lay down in brief, To
“ love *God*, and *one's Neighbour* : We must add,
“ The *true God*, the *God of Jews and Christians*,
“ That very *God* and none else : And as to
“ *Neighbour*, we must insist upon it, that it
“ means, not This or That *Sect*, *Tribe*, *Party*,
“ &c. but all *Mankind*. And now our *Rule*
“ of *Practice* begins to extend and inlarge it-
“ self beyond its primitive *Simplicity* ; but not
“ without reason. To proceed a little far-
“ ther ; Mistakes, and perverse Sentiments may
“ arise in the interpreting the word *Love*, so
“ as thereby to evacuate and frustrate the
“ Primary, and Fundamental Rule : To cor-
“ rect and remove which, it may be necessa-
“ ry still farther to *inlarge* the *Rule of Practice*,
“ and to branch it out into many other par-
“ ticulars ; which to mention would be need-
“ less. Now if such a method as This will
“ of course be necessary to preserve the *Essen-*
“ *tials of Practice* ; let it not be thought strange,
“ if the like has been made use of to preserve
“ the *Essentials of Faith*. There is the same
“ Reason, and the like occasion for Both :
“ And if due care be taken in Both, to make
“ all

“ all the Branches hang naturally upon the
 “ Primary and Fundamental Rules, and to a-
 “ dopt no *foreign* ones, as belonging thereunto
 “ when they really do not; then there is no-
 “ thing in this whole Affair but a just and
 “ prudent Care about what most of all de-
 “ serves it, and such as will be indispensably
 “ required in every faithful Minister or Stew-
 “ ard of the Mysteries of God. To return to
 “ our point in Hand: As more and more of
 “ the sacred Truths, in process of Time, came
 “ to be opposed, or brought in Question; so
 “ Creeds have been enlarged in proportion;
 “ and an explicate Profession of more and
 “ more Articles required of every Candidate
 “ for Baptism. And because This was not
 “ security sufficient, since many might forget,
 “ or not know, or not attend to what They
 “ had profess’d in their Baptism (by Them-
 “ selves or by their Sureties) it was found high-
 “ ly expedient, and necessary to insert one or
 “ more Creeds in the standing, and daily Of-
 “ fices of the Church, to remind People of
 “ That Faith which They had solemnly in-
 “ gaged to maintain, and to guard the unwary
 “ against the wily Attempts of Hereticks to
 “ pervert Them. This is the plain and true
 “ Account of *Creeds*, and of their *use* in the
 “ Christian Churches.

AND in another place*, considering Creeds in a view something different, the learned Author speaks thus. "It is a Mistake to imagine that *Creeds* were, at first, intended to teach, in full and *explicite* Terms, all that should be necessary to be believ'd by Christians. They were design'd rather for Hints and Minutes of the main *Credenda*, to be recited by *Catechumens* before Baptism: And they were purposely contrived short, that They might be the more easily retain'd in Memory, and take up the less Time in reciting. *Creeds*, very probably, at first were so far from being *Paraphrases* or *Explications* of the Form of Baptism, (or of Scripture Texts) that they went no farther, or very little farther, than the Form it self; and wanted as much *Explaining* and *Paraphrasing*, in order to be rightly and distinctly understood, as any other Words, or Forms, could do. Hence it was that the *Catechumens* were to be instructed in the *Creed*, previously to Baptism, for many Days together, *Jerom* says, for forty Days, and particularly mentions the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as the Subject matter of Instruction for all that Time. The Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* gives us a Summary of what the *Catechumens* were generally taught, previously to *Baptism*: And among the Heads of Instru-

* Sermon VIII.

" tion there intimated, the first and principal
 " relates to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. *Cyri*
 " of *Jerusalem* has left us a whole Course of
 " *Catechetical* Lectures, which He drew up for
 " the use of those that stood Candidates for
 " Baptism: And There we find that He is ve-
 " ry large and particular in explaining those
 " parts of the *Creed*, which concern the Na-
 " ture, Character, and Offices of *Father, Son,*
 " and *Holy Ghost*. Creeds would have been of
 " small use to *Catechumens*, without this Me-
 " thod of *preparatory* Instructions: And yet it
 " seems to have been solely for the use of Such
 " that *Creeds* were originally intended; being
 " first used only in the *Office* of *Baptism*, and
 " but by degrees taken in to make a part of
 " the common and daily Liturgies of the
 " Church. From hence we see the reason
 " why *Creeds* were no larger, nor more *expli-*
 " *cite*; being but a kind of Recapitulation of
 " what the *Catechumens* had been taught more
 " at large, the main Heads whereof were com-
 " mitted to Memory, and publickly recited,
 " and so became a *Creed*. A short Summary
 " of *Credenda* might Then be sufficient, after
 " the *Catechumens* had been fully and particu-
 " larly instructed in the Sense of every Arti-
 " cle. I shall observe farther, that as *Creeds*
 " became gradually enlarged, it was rather by
 " the Addition of *new* Articles (*new* I mean
 " with respect to the *Creeds*, and their inser-
 " tion

" tion into them, tho' believ'd by the Faith-
 " ful from the Beginning) than by a more *ex-*
 " *plicite* opening of the older, except in some
 " particular Cases. The reason of which seems
 " to be, that *Explications* of former Articles
 " might ordinarily be left to the *Catechists* to
 " supply by way of Catechetical Instruction.
 " It was sufficient for Creeds to have hinted
 " what was most Material, and to abound in
 " *Matter*, rather than in *Words*, to answer the
 " Use intended. As *Heresies* gave occasion,
 " new Articles were inserted in, or added to
 " the Creeds; not that They were originally
 " of greater Importance than any other Arti-
 " cles omitted, but the Opposition made to
 " some Doctrines rendred it the more neces-
 " sary, to insist upon an *explicite* Belief and Pro-
 " fession of them. To instance in the *Jeru-*
 " *salem Creed*, the oldest, it may be, of any
 " that is extant. The Article of the *Trinity*
 " was undoubtedly in it from the Beginning,
 " and perhaps none other; and That express'd
 " thus briefly; *I believe in God the Father, the*
 " *Son, and the Ho'y Ghost*. Baptism of Repen-
 " tance, Remission of Sins, Catholick Church,
 " Resurrection of the Flesh, Life everlasting,
 " are so many *new* Articles, probably added
 " afterwards, as there was occasion. The rest
 " are Insertions and *Explications*, giving a
 " more particular Description of the Na-
 " ture, Character, and Offices of the Three
 " Per-

“ Persons of the ever blessed *Trinity*: And pro-
“ bably these Additions and Illustrations came
“ in gradually, one after another, as occasion
“ served, in opposition to the Attempts of
“ Those that endeavoured to alter, mutilate,
“ corrupt, or misrepresent the *Catholick Faith*.
“ Other particulars there omitted may be as
“ necessary Points of Faith, as some there
“ mention'd: But Those were more particu-
“ larly necessary to be insisted on, at That Time,
“ and in Those Circumstances. Which I the
“ rather hint, that Creeds may not be taken
“ for compleat Catalogues of *Fundamentals*,
“ which They are not: (for indeed we shall
“ hardly find Two that have exactly the same
“ Articles, neither more nor less) but for such
“ short *Summaries* of the Christian Faith, as were
“ most proper to be inculcated before *Baptism*,
“ as an Introduction to the right Understand-
“ ing and Professing the Whole of the Chri-
“ stian Religion. I have not Room to explain
“ my self so largely upon this Head, as the Thing
“ deserves; But I shall give one Example to
“ illustrate the Truth of the Observation. The
“ Article of *Life everlasting* was, very proba-
“ bly, wanting for some Centuries in the Creeds
“ of *Rome* and *Aquileia*. Yet who can pretend
“ to say, that That was not as *necessary* and
“ *fundamental* an Article of Faith, as any is or
“ can be? But its being so easy, and obvious
“ to every Christian, and hardly at all disputed
“ might

“ might be the Reason, why, however *necessa-*
 “ *ry* it was to believe it, it was not thought
 “ *necessary* to make any explicite mention of
 “ it in those Creeds.

WHAT becomes now of the Capital Crime in altering Creeds, and its mighty foundation on the *Sacred Depositum* of the Faith? The design and nature of Creeds did evidently imply and require alterations, and the more they were alter'd occasionally, the more they became (incredible Paradox in our Author's ears!) the *Deposita* and Guardians of the Christian Faith. Where then was our Critick's sagacity and judgment to urge us with those Supplementary Additions to the *Greek* and *Latin* Creeds, which were real and necessary Improvements to the Creeds themselves both in their Use and their Form?

WELL, but observe the Conclusion of this Article. *Nay, the Athanasian Creed it self as Bishop Burnet has shewn, was a Forgery of the eighth Century.* Here lies the sharpest sting upon Ecclesiasticks, not only to alter, but to forge Creeds, and send them abroad into the World under great but false Names. But it happens unluckily, that our Author is widely mistaken in his matter of fact; neither could he depend on Bishop *Burnet's* account, or say with any tolerable propriety that *he* had shewn what is
 here

here asserted, because the Bishop has not spent above half a Page on this Subject. As to the matter of Fact, it is demonstrably false, as here represented, from the great Dr. *Waterland's Critical History of the Athanasian Creed*. Of which I will here select some considerable particulars, sufficient to expose our Author's position, and persuade the most obstinate Freethinker out of it. No higher Century than the *Eighth*, does our Author allow on Bishop *Burnet's* Authority for the Composition of the Creed call'd *Athanasian*. Whereas on the contrary; 1st. The best and most celebrated Criticks among the Moderns, place it much higher. *Gerard John Vossius*, *Bishop Usher*, *Hamon L'Estrange*, *Ruelius*, *Quiesnel*, *Heidegger*, *Cabassutius*, *Dupin*, *Tentzelius*, *Pagi*, *Antelmius*, *Tillemont*, *Montfaucon*, *Muratorius*, *Fabricius*, *Le Quien*, *Natalis Alexander*, *Bingham*, *Oudin*.^h 2^d. *Venantius Fortunatus* Bishop of *Poitiers* in *France*, wrote a Comment on this Creed about the Year 570, which was publish'd first from the *Ambrosian Library* at *Milan*, by *Muratorius* in the Year 1698ⁱ. 3^d. There are two Latin Manuscripts of the Creed still in being, besides the *Cottonian MS.* which *Bp. Usher* had seen, but is now Lost, that are judg'd to be older than the eighth Century; the famous Manuscript of *Treves*^k, which at the

^h Dr. *Waterland's* Critical History &c. Chap. 1.

ⁱ Ibid. p. 60, 61. & Append. p. 297.

^k Ibid. p. 96.

latest is set at the Year 660. The MS. of the *Ambrosian* Library^l, plac'd between the seventh and eighth Centuries, or in the Year 700. And there are five more in being not later than the eighth itself; the *Cotton* MS^m. of 703, the *Colbertine* Copyⁿ of 760, and the MS of *St. Germans*^o at *Paris* of the same Year, the MS of *Charles the Great*^p of 772, and the fifth in the Royal Library at *Paris* of 800. 4thly. It is farther shewn by the same incomparable Author, that this Creed was receiv'd into the Publick Offices of the *Gallican* Church, as early at least as the Year 670, and receiv'd as an excellent Formulary and orthodox System of Faith, as early as the year 550^q. That *Spain* had receiv'd it also as a Rule of Faith, within less than an hundred years after, about the year 630^r; That *Germany* receiv'd it likewise about the year 787^s, and *England* about the year 800^t. The 5th and last particular deducible from the *Critical History* is the most disagreeable and mortifying of any, because it saves the credit of Ecclesiasticks, by quitting them entirely of Forgery. It appears from thence^u, that the Author of the Creed whoever he was, did not certainly prefix the name of *Athanasius* or any other Person to it, but drew it up anonymous in this Elegant and

l p. 98.

p Ibid.

t p. 158.

m p. 99.

q Ibid. 148.

u Chap. 8. p. 212.

n p. 100.

r p. 154.

o 101.

f p. 156.

Expressive Form, as a seasonable Preservative against spreading Heresies. As to the name of *Athanasius*, says Dr. *Waterland*, I take it to have come thus. Upon the revival of the *Arian* Controversy in *Gaul*, under the influence of the *Burgundian* Kings, it was obvious to call one side *Athanasians*, and the other side *Arians*; and so also to name the Orthodox Faith the *Athanasian Faith*, as the other the *Arian*. This Creed therefore being a Summary of the Orthodox and Catholick Faith, might in *process of time* acquire the name of the *Athanasian Faith*, or *Fides Athanasii*, in opposition to the contrary Scheme which might as justly be call'd *fides Arii*, or the *Arian Faith*. The equivocalness of the Title, gave a handle to those that came after to understand it of a form of Faith, compos'd by *Athanasius*; just as the equivocal Title of *Apostolical* given to the *Roman Creed* occasion'd the mistake about it's being made by the *Apostles*. This appears to me the most probable account of the whole matter; and it is very much confirm'd by what we see of several Tracts, wrote in the 5th and 6th Centuries Dialogue-wise, where *Athanasius* is made the Mouth of the *Catholick* side, and *Arius* of his party, and *Photinus* of his: not meaning that *Athanasius*, *Arius*, or *Photinus* were really the Speakers in those Conferences, but the Readers were to understand the *Athanasian*, *Arian*, and *Photinian* Prin-

ciples, as being there fairly represented under those leading names.

THIS Conjecture is very much confirm'd by the various Titles of the Creeds in the Manuscripts, which are all to be seen together pag. 121, 123.

V.

Nor did they confine their Forgeries to Church-matters, but practis'd on the imperial Laws, and inserted in the Theodosian Code a Rescript of Constantine's, relating to the power of Bishops, long before repeal'd*. Who are they in this Article? Why, the holy Fathers, for there is no other Person preceding, to whom this satyirical *They* can be referr'd. So that the Personal Charge and Reflection in it's full and formidable Colours is this, that even the *Fathers*, Men of such Extraordinary Character and Repute, for *Piety* and *Holiness* in the Christian World, appear to have practis'd the most notorious Forgeries, not only in Church-matters, but also in *Civil*, by inserting in the *Theodosian Code a Rescript of Constantine, relating to the Power of Bishops, long before repeal'd. Monstrum, horrendum, informe, ingens!* But thanks be to History and Truth, *Cui lumen ademptum*. 'Tis a dark and disputable business, where no body knows, either when or by whom, or in what

* Christianity as old &c. p. 143.

part of the World the Fraud or Forgery was committed. Some one indeed, if there was such a fact, was, no doubt on't, concern'd in it deeply. But why must a *holy Father* be drawn into the scrape by malice and violence, without any clear and positive Evidence of his guilt? I hope our Author does not think that all the private obscure Members of Christendom are advanc'd to the Rank and Title of *holy Fathers*, and that however exalted in Station and Character the *holy Fathers* of the Church may be, they must all of course be involv'd in the criminal Acts of a low and Libertine vulgar, and be blasted at once with the scandal of such Imputations. This would be Candour and Equity with a witness, extremely agreeable to the Dictates of *natural Reason*. Let us now proceed to consider the Fact and it's Circumstances, which being not commonly known or understood deserve a particular Explication.

IN the latter Editions of the *Theodosian Code*, there is added at the end of the 16th Book a *Title Extravagans de Episcopali judicio*. Under this title there are three *Rescripts* of different Emperors; the first of which has *Constantine's* name prefix'd to it, is directed to *Ablavius* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, and confers a very large *judicial Power* on Bishops. This is the *Rescript of Constantine*, so boldly charg'd upon

upon the *Fathers*; and the Form of our Author's Charge, when distinctly resolv'd into Parts, is this, that there had been indeed such a Rescript of *Constantine*, but was afterwards repeal'd before the *Theodosian Code* was compil'd; now the Fraud committed by the *Fathers*, was the artful Revival of this Rescript, so long before repeal'd, by inserting it in that *Code*. This Suspicion and Criticism is taken (as our Author acknowledges by his Reference,) from our Learned *Selden*, and from such a *πρόσωπον τηλαυγές* appears with some Grandeur and Authority. To argue now on our Author's Hypothesis. We suppose with him and Mr. *Selden*, that the Rescript in dispute was really *Constantine's*, that it was repeal'd by succeeding Princes before *Theodosius* set out his *Code*, and that it afterwards appear'd by some means or other at the end of that *Code*. The Question arises how this came to pass? By no other means, says our Author, than the Fraud of the *holy Fathers*. A rash, inconsiderate, invidious Answer this, say I, because there may other Solutions be given to the Query, more candid, and charitable, and grounded on Fact and Experience. It is not impossible, that the very Compilers of the *Theodosian Code* might insert this Rescript of *Constantine* themselves. For they appear very plainly to have cast into this *Code* many Laws and Rescripts repeal'd and inconsistent with

one another. As for Instance. They give us two Rescripts of *Theodosius the Great*, one in the year 389^w, which takes away from the *Eunomians* all power of making or succeeding to a Will, with many other Rights and Enjoyments; and another^x in 394, which revokes the former, and restores the same *Eunomians* to their former Condition. A little distance after in 395 this last Rescript of *Theodosius* is repeal'd^y by his Son *Arcadius*, and the former enforc'd. By and by comes another of the same *Arcadius*^z, which nulls the fore-

w *Eunomiani Spadoes*, * nec faciendi nec adipiscendi habeant licentiam testamenti. Quod circa omnes, quos vivos Lex invenerit, volumus custodiri; nec quenquam præteritæ cujuscumque voluntatis privilegio defensari; cum, seu facta prius testamenta, seu infecta doceantur, post hanc nostri oraculi sanctionem non habeant possidendi licentiam, non petendi, non etiam relinquendi hæredem, nomine principali, non fidei commissario, non legatario, non tacito fidei commissio; vel quæcunque in hujuscemodi negotiis nuncupationem Juris ordo constituit; sed omnium, quæ talium esse, vel futura esse constituerit, ut caduca fisci nostri viribus vindicentur. Nihil ad summum habeant commune cum reliquis. Datum III. Non. Maj. Med. Timasio & Promoto Coss. (389.) * De hac voce vid. Gothofred. in loc.

x *Eunomianis* ne caperent aliquid, vel relinquerent testamento, Legem dudum credidimus promulgandam: Quam quidem nunc consilio pleniori revocamus: Vivant jure communi, scribant pariter & scribantur hæredes. Dat. xv. Kal. Jul. Hadrianop. Arcad. III. & Honor. II. A. A. Coss. (394.)

y — *Eunomianorum* perfidam mentem, & nequissimam Sectam speciali commemoratione damnamus, statuimusque, omnia quæ contra illorum vesaniam decreta sunt, inlibata custodiri. Illud addentes, ne quis memoratæ Sectæ militandi, aut testandi, vel ex testamento sumendi habeat facultatem; ut sit jam omnibus commune damnum, quibus etiam communis est Religionis Furor;

going.

going. Some pages from hence we find a Rescript of *Theodosius Junior* in 410, which sets aside his Father *Arcadius's* Indulgence to the *Eunomians*. This, I believe, is Specimen sufficient to shew, that notwithstanding this Rescript of *Constantine* had been not only virtually but expressly repeal'd before the composition of the *Theodosian Code*, it was far from being impossible, that the very Compilers of the *Code* themselves might insert it in the *Code*. Mr. *Selden*, our Author's Advocate was not aware of this, and therefore allows, if so much could be prov'd, the *genus hieraticum* might come off victorious. *Nec enim in Theodosiani locum habere quibat, nisi admittas eos qui Codicem illum congerebant, Sanctiones sibi invicem planè contrarias in re tam insignis momenti oscitantius infarsisse, quod credibile omninò non est.* You see Mr. *Selden* takes that for granted,

cessante videlicet, si quid à *Patre Nostro* quibusdam fuerat super testandi jure, beneficio speciali concessum. *Dat. 111. Id. Mart. CP. Olybrio & Probino Coss. (395.)*

z Conficiendorum testamentorum dari *Eunomianis* præcipimus potestatem, & concedi id, quod Divi Genitoris nostri data nuper præceptio continebat. *Dat. VIII. Kal. Jul. (legit Gothofredus rectè, Jan) Constp. Olybrio & Probino Coss. (395.)*

a Manentibus, quæ in *Eunomianos* Lex Divi Patris *Clementia* nostræ jamdudum constituit, (*Dat. 111 Id. Mart.*) nihil deinceps invicem sibi vel donare, vel ipsos donatione consequi; nihil item relinquere, nec capere testamento decernimus. Careant emolumentis, quæ ex donationibus, vel morientium voluntate alternis solebant illecebris, fraude, & circumventionem percipere; ut in totum utriusque juris communione priventur; &c. *Dat. Kal. Mart. Varane. V. C. Cos. (410.) Cod. Theodosian. Lib. 16. Tit. v.*

which

^b which now is disprov'd, and more fully by *Gothofred*^c. So that I think our Caviller on this Hypothesis must fairly retract his Suit against the *Fathers*, must own his Error and Ignorance to be very profound, and his Malice egregiously impotent.

BUT however, by way of a Θεὸς ἀπὸ μυχῶν I will here disclose to him a secret, which will probably raise in him both new Spirits, and a new battery against the *Fathers*. The secret is this, that the Rescript, which he and Mr. *Selden* take to be a genuine Rescript of *Constantine*, is certainly spurious, and that *Gothofred* has evidently shewn it to be so in his excellent Commentary on this Rescript. So that now the Case is quite alter'd; the Rescript is allow'd not only to be fraudulently inserted in the *Theodosian Code*, but also to be wholly an arrant Forgery. *Id verò serìò triumphat Noster; Hæc non successit, aliâ aggrediamur viâ.* This must sure bear hard upon the memory of the *Holy Fathers*, and distress them in Difficulties not very easily surmountable.

No such difficulties at all, I assure you. They are still where they were before, remov'd far enough out of the reach of such trifling Attacks and Impeachments. Let us first con-

^b *Selden* ad *Flet.* Cap. 5. §. 6.

^c *Proleg. Cod. Theodos.* Chap. 2. §. 5.

sider who are the *Holy Fathers*, and what particular Persons are meant by those high and honourable Appellations. ^d Such, no doubt on't, of the Antients, as have nobly distinguish'd themselves to all Posterity by their admirable Lives, Examples, and Writings. Now to the Point in Hand. Some or other of these *Fathers*, you say, was the Person who forg'd the Rescript. Why the *Fathers* emphatically and by way of Distinction? Were there no other Christians, and Degrees of Christians besides the *Fathers*? Is it likely that Persons of Eminent Piety, the Lights and Ornaments of the Church should be guilty of Fraud and Forgery, rather than hundreds of others of less Reputation, and worse Dispositions?

BESIDES it is very remarkable, that we do not find any mention of the controverted Rescript before the ninth Century. The first that quotes it, is *Benedictus Levita*, the Man who added an Appendix of three Books to *Ansegisus's* * Collection of *Capitulars*; and next to him, a few years after, the 3^d Council of *Valentia*. If this be true, as the Learned agree it is, I am very inclinable to think that the

^d See *Buddei Isagog.* p. 534. & seq.

* Mr. *Selden* by mistake confounds the collections of *Benedictus* with those of *Ansegisus*. *Ad Flet. Cap.* 5 §. 9. But *Baluzius* has Learnedly shewn the difference between them both in Method and Authority. *Pref. ad Capitul.* §. 43, 44, 45, 47.

Rescript might not be forg'd, or at least not appear before *Charles the Great's* time, in the close of the eighth Century. This was the time when the famous Decretal Epistles made their Entrance into the World^e, which rais'd the Papal Power to such an exorbitant Height in succeeding Ages. The Subject of the Rescript it self has a near relation to those spurious Epistles, and therefore it is far from being improbable that the same Person might be Author of both Forgeries. What adds some farther shew and ground to this Suspicion is, that the first Person who quotes it is *Benedictus* abovemention'd, a Writer in the beginning of the ninth Century. This is the Man suspected by *Blondell* of sending abroad those very Epistles, and by Dr. *Cave*^f of giving them additions and improvements. So that allowing all this to be only Conjecture, it is such a Conjecture as takes off our Author's Suggestions against the *Fathers*; and has so much foundation in History, as to stand secure against illnatur'd *Conjectures* on the other side, that have not the least foundation either in History or Reason.

^e *Steph. Baluz. Præf. ad Ant. Augustin.*

^f *Histor. Litter. Vol. 1. p. 525.*

VI.

A SIXTH Complaint and Remonstrance is this. *The further back we go, the greater was their recourse to pious frauds.* The little word *Their*, you may see, is a relative Term, which is us'd by an artful contrivance to reflect this general Charge back on the *holy Fathers*, and to make a proper connexion between this and the foregoing Sentences. As to the matter of Fact, 'tis old and common, observ'd in all Ecclesiastical Criticks, who were most of them *Priests* themselves, and to whom our Author himself is oblig'd for all the knowledge he has about them. But as to his reference to the *Primitive Fathers*, 'tis false and contemptible, perpetually running in the Thoughts and Discourse of the *Free-thinking* Tribe, on purpose to raise suspicions and jealousies in weak, unguarded, and injudicious People, to shake by degrees their Belief of the Scriptures, and of course of the Christian Religion; and at last to delude and attach them as Proselytes to the Folly of Deism and Infidelity. There is no other ground and Authority for these fallacious insinuations than what I shall now in short lay before the Reader; which, I desire our *Deist*, if he finds himself able, to discuss and confute in particular Instances, and not

^g Christianity as old &c. p. 143. Ed. 8^{va}.

inveigh and declaim in ridiculous generals against *primitive Frauds*, without telling the Reader the Nature and Rise of them, and what Effect and Operation they ought to have upon wise and intelligent Men.

THE pious Frauds of *primitive* Antiquity, which are so much exclaim'd against by the *Free-thinking* Writers, are justly reducible to three sorts. 1st. Those which are known to owe their production to notorious *Hereticks*. And 2^{dly}. Those which are *thought* to proceed from *Catholick* but *private* Christians. And 3^{dly}. Those which appear without any plain discovery of their Author. These are the only *Frauds* and *Forgeries* among Primitive Christians which I ever heard of; and none of these can our Critical Author with all his Acquaintance put together, evince to have taken their birth from the *holy Fathers*. It would be both an endless and needless task, to give a distinct and critical account of all the *Forgeries* in the earliest Times of Christianity, and to shew not only how little the *Holy Fathers* were concern'd *themselves* in the Frame and Contexture of them, but also how much Assistance and Light they have given to Modern Christians in their searches and enquiries about them. Neither indeed does a general Charge, as our Author's is, deserve a particular Vindication; 'tis as easily denied as affirm'd,

affirm'd, and the merits of the Cause must still depend on Proof in particular Instances. If the matter is clear and notorious, let him open, explain, and defend it. If it is not, say nothing in the trite, abusive, and drollery way about it. Common Readers have too much *natural* Sense, to swallow implicitly such general Charges, and learned Readers have too much Knowledge not to understand and despise them.

WELL, but our Author's assertion has eminent vouchers^h; *Scaliger*, it seems, and *Casaubon*, and *Blondel*, and *Stillingfleet*, and *Fell*, are all on the same side, all declare very loudly for *Pious Frauds*. Amazing and terrible! And yet, as it happens, there is nothing in all the quotations of three out of five of these eminent Men, *Casaubon*, *Stillingfleet*, and *Fell*, which I would not confess and subscribe to my self. What is it then which they tell us? Why truly, that *pious frauds* were numerous in the Primitive times? And what is all this to the *Primitive* and *holy Fathers*? Just as much as the frequent Frauds and Forgeries in the Heathen World related to a *Plato*, a *Cicero*, or a *Plutarch*. As to *Scaliger*, and *Blondel*, they indeed express their Discoveries in sharper and stronger terms, but neither of them mention a syllable of *Fathers*, and what they do assert

^h Christianity as old &c. p. 143.

they assert in the loosest generals, and more, I am sure, than either of them (as great as they were in the Learned World) could ever make out from Antiquity. They were both indeed (especially *Joseph Scaliger*) very excellent Criticks; but yet it is very well known, how rash and groundless they sometimes prov'd in their Criticism; Bp. *Pearson*, Bp. *Beveridge*, and Dr. *Hammond* have shewn us considerable Errors in *Blondel*; and *Valesius*, *Petavius*, and *Vossius* with others, have shewn as frequent and extraordinary in *Scaliger*.

VII.

MY Author has two or three other passages in the same invective, declamatory, general strain, which expect a word or two more before this Section is concluded. He breaks out in one place into this pathetick and melancholly Reflection. *How unhappy were we of the Laity, had we not the reason and nature of things (which no Priest can alter) to depend on; but were entirely oblig'd to take our religious Sentiments from Men, who as far as we have any account of things, have even from the earliest Times not scrupl'd to forge not only whole Passages, but whole Books, and left nothing entire on which they could lay their foul Hands.*ⁱ Deplorable then to be sure would the *Laicks* condition appear,

ⁱ Christianity as old &c. p. 144.

if such were their Case! For how could a well-dispos'd *Laick* confide in any *Priest's* religious Instructions, when the whole generation of *Priests* are convicted of *Fraud* and *Forgery*! But pray let me ask with *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*^k, who are the Discoverers of all these *Frauds* and *Forgeries*? The *Christian Priests* themselves; such as *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Jerom*, and *Austin* among the Antients; and *Casaubon*, *Daille*, *Fell*, *Stillingfleet*, *Cave*, and *Fabricius* among the Moderns. So far are they with thousands of others from concealing or propagating them, or thinking their Cause needs them. And I challenge him and the whole fraternity, to shew one single one that they discover'd, and owe not to the Clergy. If this be true, why may not the *Laick* receive from the *Priests* religious as well as *Critical Knowledge*? And why must he always suspect the *Honesty* and *Integrity* of those very Persons who have given such eminent Instances of it, to the great Improvement and Satisfaction of the *Laicks* themselves? *Most able Masters of Stratagem!* says the Learned *Phileleutherus*, ever to hope to vanquish Religion by Arms borrow'd from the *Priests*! They may be sure, there's no danger of the strong Town's being taken, while the Garrison within can afford to lend the besiegers Powder.

^k Part II. p. 41. Ed. 6.

VIII.

BUT now he appears in a second Passage with an Air of Importance. For he not only tells us that *antient* Priests were guilty of horrible Forgeries, but also the *Principles* and *Reasons* on which they acted, and confirms all this by the testimony of a celebrated *antient Bishop*. Says he¹, *If they believ'd that a certain set of Opinions was necessary to Salvation, then they must have thought themselves in Charity oblig'd to take the most proper Methods to bring Men to embrace them; and consequently must have believ'd it their Duty to substitute some words of their own, which would best express those Opinions, on which Mens Salvation depended, in the room of others which were apt to lead them into fatal Errors; since by thus changing of Sounds, they might save Millions of Souls, who they were confident would otherwise everlastingly perish. Must not the same principle that oblig'd them to impose their own words, instead of the words of God, in their Creeds and Articles on pain of Damnation, equally oblige them to act the same part in relation to the Scripture? And if Men have stuck so close to this Principle, that they have (wherever they had a convenient opportunity) left out, added to, or alter'd all other Books of Religion whatever, which have fallen into their hands; there can be*

no reason to think, they would not do the same with the Bible. The Reader, I believe, as well as my self is very much puzzled, to find out the Force, Argument, and natural coherence of all the several Sentences in this passage. There's something, depend on't, of mighty consequence to *Priests* in the *Thought*, whatever ambiguity and darkness may lie in the *Expression*. Let us therefore separate a little the Parts, and consider them distinctly and minutely by themselves. If they believ'd that a certain set of Opinions was necessary to Salvation. The meaning of which hypothetical Sentence, if there be any Truth or Pertinency in it, is this; If they believ'd that certain Doctrines (or one Faith) were made by the Scriptures the terms of Salvation; Then they must have thought themselves in Charity oblig'd, to take the most proper methods to bring Men to embrace them. Justly inferr'd! For the Persons he speaks of must have certainly thought and acted in this manner, being *Stewards of the Mysteries of God^m*, and *Ministers of Reconciliationⁿ*. And consequently must have believ'd it their Duty to substitute some words of their own, which would best express those Opinions, on which Mens Salvation depended, in the room of others, which were apt to lead them into fatal Errors. Substitute! where? or how? And what other words are those, that were apt to lead them

^m 1 Cor. 4. 1.

ⁿ 2 Cor. 5. 18.

into fatal Errors? All this is nothing but Artifice, begging the Question, gross Insinuation, and a lame Introduction to subsequent Charges. Then are we ask'd this significant question. *Must not the same Principle, that oblig'd them to impose their own Words instead of the Words of God, in their Creeds and Articles, on pain of Damnation, equally oblige them to act the same part in relation to the Scripture?* No, by no means. Such a thought and conclusion would be rash, absurd, and ridiculous to the last Degree. 'Tis suppos'd that the Principle which gives foundation to *Creeds*, or *Articles*, is a pious Zeal and concern for the Doctrines of *Scripture*, and the happiness of Men depending upon them. This Principle does never oblige us to impose our own words instead of the words of God, any farther than as they are thought to agree in Sense to the words of God. And the only Design in changing the Sounds is to guard the weak, unattentive, and injudicious against false Interpretations of *Scripture*; and the Persons that impose such *Creeds* and *Articles*, refer the Reader to *Scripture* for the Truth of both, allowing and asserting the *Scripture* alone to be the Rule of Faith, and desiring that all their *Creeds* and *Articles* may be try'd and examin'd by that sacred Criterion. Besides this, the Imposers of *Creeds* and *Articles* have too much Religion and Understanding not to

o See Dr. Waterland's Case of Arian Subscription. p. 20, 21.

know, that to *add to* or *take away* from the *Book of the Law* is dangerous Presumption and Wickedness; but to open, explain, and interpret the Law, in *Creeeds* and *Articles* with Judgment and Learning, for the use and benefit of the Church, is both their Duty and Charity. Where now is our Author's Conclusion from the *Principle* mention'd? Which is so far from being a Consequence from it, that it proves a direct Contradiction to it. For how can that *Principle* induce any Men to corrupt the *Scripture*, which is grounded on the highest *Reverence* of it's *Doctrines*? And how can the *Reverence* of the *Scripture-Doctrines* be grounded or supported, but upon an equal *Reverence* of the *Letter* of it? Take away the *Letter*, and the *Doctrine* is destroy'd. *Substitute* only your *own words* in the Books of *Scripture*, and then 'tis no longer a *Divine* but an *Human Law*. And if after this, you appeal to the *Scripture* thus corrupted and interpolated, for the truth of your *Creeeds* and *Articles*, what is this, but to prove your *Doctrines* in *one* place from your *own Doctrines* in *another*? Monstrous and impracticable! And yet is our Author as confident in it, as if it were perfectly rational and certain! He imagins that all *Imposers* of *Creeeds* and *Articles* must inevitably alter and deface the *Scripture*, in order to preserve the true *doctrine* of *Scripture*. Notable Man this
for

for Inference and Demonstration!

THUS far he argues *a priori* against Ecclesiasticks. With what success and Conviction every one sees. Now he proceeds *a posteriori* to Fact and Experience. *And if Men have stuck so close to this Principle, that they have (wherever they had a convenient opportunity) left out, added to, or alter'd all other Books of Religion whatever which have fallen into their hands; there can be no reason to think they would not do the same with the Bible. Who are the Men in this Sentence? If Fathers and Saints, set up just before as the proper and particular Objects of this Accusation, 'tis utterly false and groundless. If any others, utterly foreign and trifling. But take it which way you will, we have here a most eminent Instance of Honesty, Acumen, and Argumentation. If Men (i. e., no body knows who, where, or when,) have left out, added to, or alter'd all other Books of Religion whatever, which have fallen into their hands, (which is nothing but Fable and Romance) there can be no reason to think, they would not do the same with the Bible. Astonishing and terrible conclusion! If the whole Body of the Clergy, (for these, I suppose, are the Persons pointed at) in antient and modern times, had been foolish and wicked enough to corrupt all other Books of Religion whatever, then there can be no reason to think, they would not have done the same with the Bible.*

ble. Why truly, *if* they *had* been guilty of the one, they might, for ought I know, have been guilty of the other. But where are the Premises? Usher'd in they are indeed with a pompous *If*, at the beginning of the Syllogism, but afterwards shamefully dropt in the middle, and left to shift for themselves. And thus it seems are the *Christian Priests*, antient and modern, to be stript at once of all Reputation and Character by a poor contemptible *if*; and the only return which they are to meet with, for all their honest and learned Discoveries of *Frauds* and *Forgeries*, is at last, to pass for Cheats and Knaves themselves, and to be publicly vilify'd with old and infamous Stories, which they themselves first told and expos'd to the World!

BUT now at last comes the *Primitive Father* his Voucher. 'Tis no wonder, says that *primitive Father* Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, that some attempt to adulterate the holy Writings of our Lord, since they have basely falsify'd such as are of an inferior Authority. And, 'tis no wonder, say I, that *Dionysius* or any other *primitive Father* comes in to our Authors assistance, when Violence and Torture are us'd to force him, and Blunder, Malice, and Prejudice all concur to misrepresent him. *Dionysius* is speaking here of Hereticks^p, not *Fathers* or *Catholicks*;

^p Conquestus est ipse *Dionysius*, se adhuc in vivis agente *Hereticos* quosdam Epistolas suas corrupisse, quædam ex illis expungentes, quædam adjicientes. *Cave Histor. Litter.* Vol. 1. p. 44.

he had just before complain'd, that his own Epistles had suffer'd corruptions⁹, and charges them all upon the οἱ τῷ Διαβόλῳ Ἀπόστολοι, *the Ministers of the Devil*. To these therefore the *some* (τῖνες) in the following Sentence must all be referr'd; he means very probably the *Marcionites*, for these were the *Hereticks*, which the same *Dionysius* had engag'd with in one of his Epistles, and whom we know to be very notorious in adulterating Scripture, and other Writings. So now it seems, the *Primitive Father Dionysius* has nothing to say and depose against his brethren the Clergy, but leaves their inveterate adversary just as destitute of proper Evidence, as he is of Probity and Understanding.

AND here I must take my leave at present of my *Freethinking* Adversary, having finish'd the Article of *Antient Frauds*, and drawn out Remarks upon it to a Length sufficient; what remains to be examin'd under other Heads, shall appear (God willing) in subsequent Papers, with as much Expedition, as the Subject and circumstances will allow.

ἡ Ἐπιστολὴ ἀδελφῶν ἀξιώσαντων με γράψαι, ἔγραψα. Καὶ ταύταις Οἱ τοῦ Διαβόλου Ἀποστολοὶ ζιζανίων μηχανικαί, αἱ μὲν ἔκαστον τῶν, αἱ δὲ προσθέντες εἰς τὸ βλάψαι καὶ καταστρέφαι. Ὅτι θαυμάσιον ἄρα, εἰ καὶ τῶν κυριακῶν βιβλίων γίνονται τινες ἐπιτεύχονται γραφῶν, ὅπου καὶ ταῖς αὐτοῦ ταῖς ἐπιτεύχουσι. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 4. Cap. 23.*

F I N I S.

APPENDIX.

GIVING

A TRUE ACCOUNT

OF THE

STOICAL FATE

IN

DEFENCE

OF THE

Lord Bishop of *LONDON*.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
THE
AMERICAN
MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

A TRIP TO
THE
MOUNTAINS OF
THE
WEST

BY
JOHN
W. COOPER
AND
J. B. COOPER

APPENDIX.

Giving a true Account of the Stoical Fate.

THE Bishop of London, in his Second *Pastoral Letter*, had express'd himself thus concerning the Stoical Doctrine of Fate. *The Philosophers taught Doctrines, which directly tend to encourage Vice and Wickedness in the World.—Such was the Doctrine of Fate, or Men's doing every thing through Necessity, and not by Choice; which takes away all Virtue and Vice, and leaves no Place for Rewards and Punishments either here or hereafter; and yet this was the avow'd Doctrine of one famous Sect among them*^a, referring to the *Stoicks*. This Sentence of the Bishop's has lately been censured more than once by a Writer^b of some Distinction and Credit, who calls this Notion of his Lordship's a *Vulgar Error*; and asserts, that the *Stoical Fate*, however it has been misunderstood, did not at all interfere with the Freedom of human Actions, nor draw such dangerous Consequences after it, as the Bishop and others have charged upon it. What particular Reasons this Gentleman may have to himself for his high Opinion of the *Stoicks*, or what peculiar Advantages and

^a P. 123.

^b Plea for Human Reason. p. 28. 29. Ed. 2. Defence &c. p. 87. Calumny no Conviction p. 29, 30.

Opportunities he may have met with of finding their genuine Sentiments in this Point, I cannot pretend to determine; but as far as I can see into that Matter, there is not sufficient Ground for any bold and confident Assertions in Favour of the *Stoicks*, nor Authority sufficient to charge his Lordship indecently with *Vulgar Error*.

THE several Authorities and Reasons, which incline me to think with his Lordship, I shall give in the following Pages, and shall obviate the few Objections which are urged on the opposite Side.

THE first considerable Writer extant, that treats of this Subject, is *Cicero*. He, in his Book *de Fato*, has the following Passage. *Those who introduce an eternal Series of Causes, deprive the Mind of Man of Free-will, and subject it entirely to a necessary Fatality*^a. If so, the *Stoicks*, according to *Cicero*, must *deprive the Mind of Man of Free-will, and subject it entirely to a necessary Fatality*; for certainly *they* were the Persons, who taught and maintain'd *an eternal Series of Causes*. In other Places the Form and Turn of his Argument evidently implies, that the *Stoicks* themselves extended a necessary Fate to human Actions. Speaking to *Chry-*

^a Qui introducunt causarum seriem sempiternam, ii mentem hominis voluntate libera spoliata, necessitate Fati devinciunt, *de Fat*, Cap. 9. *sub fin.*

Sippus's

Chrysippus's Rerum Contagio, he expresses himself thus.
^b While he talks in this manner, he does not see, what the Point in dispute between us is. For it does not follow, that because Men have different inclinations and Dispositions by Natural and antecedent Causes, there should also be Natural and antecedent Causes of our Wills and Desires. For if this were the Case, nothing could remain in our Power. Carneades argued against him just in the same manner ^c. Is it not clear from hence that *Chrysippus* himself contended for natural and antecedent Causes of our Wills and Desires? And does not *Cicero* and *Carneades* charge that Doctrine with the same Consequences that the Bishop of London does? Again he says of *Chrysippus*, that he rather inclin'd to those who would free the motions of the Mind from Necessity, but still while he uses his (Stoical) phrases, he falls into such Difficulties, that he confirms against his will the necessity of Fate ^d.

^b Hæc differens, quâ de re agatur, & in quo causa consistat, non videt. Non enim si alii ad alia propensiores sint propter causas naturales & antecedentes, idcirco etiam nostrarum voluntatum atque appetitionum sunt Causæ naturales & antecedentes. Nam nihil esset in nostrâ potestate, si res ita se haberet. *Ibid.* Cap. 5

^c Carneades hoc totum genus non probabat. — Cujus erat hæc conclusio. Si omnia antecedentibus causis fiunt, omnia naturali colligatione consertè contextèque fiunt. Quod si ita est, omnia necessitas efficit. Id si verum est, nihil est in nostrâ potestate. *Ibid.* Cap. 14.

^d *Chrysippus* — apolicat se ad eos potius, qui necessitate motus animos (*Leg* cum *Davis* animorum) liberatos volunt. Dum autem verbis utitur suis, delabitur in eas difficultates, ut necessitatem fati confirmet invitus. *Ibid.* Cap. 17.

And

And again. *Chrysippus sweating and labouring how to prove that all things are effected by Fate, and that something remains at the same time in our Power, is very much puzzled and perplex'd.* What may be here Objected in relation to *Chrysippus*, shall be taken notice of in its proper place.

FROM *Cicero* I proceed to *Plutarch*, who declares it to be a direct and necessary Consequence of the *Stoical Principles concerning Fate*, that Men cannot act by *Choice but Impulse*, and censures severely *Chrysippus's* way of explaining and mollifying them^f. The Passage, I think, cannot justly be translated into English, because of particular Greek Expressions and Terms in it, and therefore I chuse to refer to it in

^e *Chrysippus æstuans laboransque quonam pacto explicet & facto omnia fieri, & esse aliquid in nobis, intricatur. Cicero. ap. Gellium. Lib. 6. Cap. 2.*

^f Εἰ γὰρ μήτι δικάζεις, μήτι βλάπτονται διὰ τὴν εἰμαρμένην, δὴλας ὅτι καὶ κατὰ φύσιν, καὶ φρονῶσιν, καὶ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν βέλαιας, καὶ ἀφελόνται διὰ τὴν εἰμαρμένην, ἀλλ' οἰχεται τὸ πάντων αἰτιᾶν εἶναι τὴν εἰμαρμένην. — Τὴν δ' εἰμαρμένην, αἰτιᾶν ἀνίκητον καὶ ἀκώλυτον καὶ ἀτρεπτον ἀποφαίνων, αὐτὸς ἀτροπον καλεῖ καὶ ἀδράστιαν, καὶ ἀναγκὴν, καὶ πιπρωμένην, ὡς πῶς ἀπασιν ἐπιπύεται. Πότερον ἔν τις συγκατεβίσεις μὴ λέγῃται ἴδιον εἶναι, μὴδὲ τις ἀρετὴς, μὴδὲ τις κακία, μὴδὲ τὸ κατεργᾶν, μὴδὲ τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν; εἰ (leg. ἢ) τὴν εἰμαρμένην λέγῃται ἑλλείπεσθαι εἶναι, καὶ τὴν πιπρωμένην ἀπεράτῳ, καὶ τὰς τῷ Διὶ κινήσεις καὶ ἡέσεις ἀσυντελείας; τότε γὰρ ἔπιταί τι μὴ τῷ αὐτοτελεῖ, τι δὲ τῷ προκαταρκτικῷ μόνον αἰτίαν εἶναι τὴν εἰμαρμένην. αὐτοτελεῖς μὲν αἰτία πάντων οὕσα, τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ ἐκούσιον ἀναίρει. προκαταρκτικῷ δὲ τὸ ἀκώλυτος εἶναι καὶ τελεσιουργὸς ἀπολλύει. *Stoic. Repugn. p. 1056.*

the

the Original. He has other Passages of the same Import, which are much too numerous and large to be all inserted and applied in this place ^B.

AFTER him *Justin Martyr*, a Philosopher himself, and converted from *Paganism* to *Christianity* has these words. *Neither do we (Christians) say, that Men are either Active or Passive by Fate, but that every one does right or wrong according to his own Will.—Which the Stoicks not understanding, laid it down as a Principle that all things were effected by a necessity of Fate* ^h. He speaks, I believe, too plain to need any Comment.

NEXT to him I produce the Learned *Alexander Aphrodisiensis*, who seems to have studied the Subject as much as any Man of the Antients, and I think has clear'd it in relation to the *Stoicks* beyond all of them. He dedicates his Book to the Emperors *Severus* and *Antoninus*, about the year of *Christ* 200. To cite all the Passages pertinent to the present purpose would be tedious and needless; I will therefore select but a few of the closest and strongest. *Now that those who attribute all things to*

^g See p. 1055. 1049, 1050, 1051. De Fato. 568.

^h Οὐδὲ κατ' εἰμαρμένην πράττειν τὰς ἀνθρώπους ἢ πάχιν τὰ γινόμενα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μὲν προαίρεσιν ἔκαστον κατεβούη ἢ ἀμαρτάνειν. — ὁ μὴ νοήσας οἱ Στωϊκοὶ κατ' εἰμαρμένης ΑΝΑΓΚΗΝ ΠΑΝΤΑ γίνεσθαι ἀποφάνητο. Apolog. 2.

Fate, do not preserve (the τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν) Human Liberty, is evident from what has been said. And those who destroy the τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, do by consequence utterly confound and overturn Human Life as far as in them liesⁱ. He certainly must be understood to speak this of the Stoicks, as well as of any other fatalists, because they did with the rest attribute all things to Fate, and in the pages preceding Alexander confutes the Shifts and Evasions peculiar to the Stoicks. Besides this a little lower, he gives us the Stoical system^k of the Mind of the Universe pervading, sustaining, and directing all things; the eternal Chain and Series of Causes, and the necessary successive dependance and production of all Effects from them, exactly agreeable to Seneca and Marcus Antoninus. Now this very System he utterly rejects and condemns, as destroying entirely the Liberty of Human Actions, and of Con-

ⁱ Οὐ μὲρ ὑπὲρ σώζουσι τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν οἱ λέγοντες πάντα κατ' εἰρημμένην — ἐκ τῶν εἰρημνίων γνώριμοι. Ἀλλὰ μὲρ πῶς ἀναίρουσι τὸ εἶναι τι ἔτι ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ἐπιταί τὸ συγχεῖν τι καὶ ἀνατρέπτειν ὅσον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον. *De Fat.* p. 168. *Ed. Græc.* 1534.

^k Φασὶ δὲ τὸν κόσμον τινὲς εἶναι ὄντα, καὶ πάντα τὰ ὄντα ἐν αὐτῷ περιέχοντα, καὶ ὑπὸ φύσεως διοικόμενοι ζωικῆς τε καὶ λογικῆς, καὶ τοιαύτης, ἔχουσιν τὴν τῶν ὄντων διοίκησιν αἰδίον κατὰ εἰρημνίαν τινὰ καὶ τάξιν προϊῶσαν. Τῶν πρώτων τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα γινομένοις αἰτίαι γινομένης, καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ συνδεδωμένοι ἀπάνται ἀλλήλοις. Καὶ μήτε ὅτι πρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένου, ὡς μὴ πάντως ἐπακολουθεῖν αὐτῷ καὶ συνῆλθαι ὡς αἰτία ἑτέρῳ τι. Μήτ' ἂν τῶν ἐπιγινομένων πρὸς ἀπολέλυτῳ δυναμένου τῶν πραγμάτων, ὡς μὴ τινι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖν ὡς περ συνδεδωμένοι. Ἀλλὰ πάντα τε τὰ γινομένα ἑτέρῳ τι ἐπακολουθεῖν ἡρημνίαν αὐτῷ ἐξ ἀναγκῆς ὡς αἰτίας. *ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝ* τὸ γινομένο ἔχει τι περ αὐτῷ, καὶ ὡς αἰτία συνήρηται. *Ibid.* p. 169.

sequence

Sequence all Laws, Virtue and Vice, Praise and Dispraise, Rewards and Punishments¹.

NEXT to *Alexander* is the celebrated *Plotinus*, who does not scruple to pronounce upon the *Stoical Chain* with as much severity and vehemence as the other. *This Doctrine*, says he, *establisbes an absolute Necessity of every thing; and as all causes are included, 'tis impossible for any thing not to happen according to them. For there is nothing to hinder, or that can make things happen otherwise, since all things are thus concluded by Fate. Now this being the state of things, we have nothing at all left us, but to be carried which way soever they drive us. And Human Liberty will be nothing but a mere Name*^m.

1 Εἰ ἔστι τοιαύτη ἐμπαρμένη, ὅτε ἔστι νόμος ἀναγκραίου δὲ νόμου, ἔστι αὐτῷ ἀμαρτηματὶς τε ἔστι κακοπαθῶν, ἀναγκρῆς δὲ ἂν, ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ διὰ τῆς ἀκλυσίας ἐλάμβανον τῆς κατὰ τὴν λόγον, ἀρετῆς τε καὶ κακίας, καὶ ΤΟ ΕἶΝΑΙ ΤΙ ΕΦ' ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΙΣ, ἀκλυσῶν καὶ καλόν, καὶ ἱππικόν τε καὶ ψικόν, καὶ τιμῆς τε καὶ κηλασίας ἀξίον. — Μη τὸ εἶναι πρῶτος μὴτε κηλασίας, ἔπειτα τῷ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΓΙΝΕΣΘΑΙ ΚΑΘ' ΕΜΠΑΡΜΕΝΗΝ, ὡς διδοικαί. Ibid. p. 170.

Im Λοιπὸν δὲ ἴδω τὴν ἐπιπλέκουσαν ἔστι οἷον συνίρουσαν ἀλλήλοις πάν-
τα, καὶ τὸ πᾶς εἶναι (leg. εἶναι) ἐκαστοῦ ἐπιφύουσαν, ἀρχὴν πησιμένην μί-
κρον εἶναι ἢ πάντα κατὰ λόγους σπερματικὰς περσινεταί. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἂν
ἢ αὐτὴ ἢ δεξιά ἐγγύς ἐκίνης τῆς πᾶσαν καὶ ἁλόν καὶ κίνησιν ἡμετέρων
τε καὶ πᾶσαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ὄλων ψυχῆς ἢ κινῶν λεγόμενης, Εἰ ΒΟΥΛΕΤΑΙ
ΤΙΣ ΗΜΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΑΣΤΟΙΣ χρεῖσθαι τὸ ΠΑΡ ΗΜΩΝ ΠΟΙΕΙΝ ΤΙ.
Ἐχον μὲν ἂν τὴν πάντως πάντων ΑΝΑΓΚΗΝ, καὶ πάντων ἐλημεμένων αἰ-
τίων, ὅτε ἔστιν ἕκαστον μὴ ἢ χρεῖσθαι. Οὐδὲν γὰρ τὸ κώλυτον, ἢ ἄλλως
χρεῖσθαι ποιήσιν, καὶ πάντα ἐκίπτειν ἐν τῇ ἐμπαρμένῃ. Τοιαῦτα δὲ ὄντα
ὡς ἀπὸ μίας ἀρχῆς ἀρμηνεύειν, ἡμῶν ὕδιν καταλείψαι, ἢ φέρεται ὅση
ἂν ἐκίνα αὐτῇ. Αἱ ΤΕ ΓΑΡ ΦΑΝΤΑΣΙΑΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΠΡΟΗΓΗΣΑΜΕ-
ΝΟΙΣ, ΑἴΤΕ ΟΡΜΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑΣ ΕΞΟΝΤΑΙ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΤΕ
ΜΟΝΟΝ ΤΟ ΕΦ' ΗΜΙΝ ΕΣΤΑΙ. Plotin. Ennead 3. Lib. 1. Cap. 7.

So likewise says *Nemefius* in his Elegant and Excellent Book *De naturâ hominis*. The Stoical Philosophers destroy in truth and reality all Human Liberty, as I have prov'd aboveⁿ. He refers to Chapter 35th, where he considers Fate in several views. Those, says he, who teach that Human Liberty and Fate are both secur'd without interfering with one another, (and those are among the Stoicks Chrysippus and Philopator, and many others of Distinction,) prove in effect nothing more, than that all things do really happen by Fate. For if they allow (as they do) that our Inclinations and Desires are given us by Fate, and that sometimes they are obstructed by Fate, sometimes not, it is then plain, that Fate does every thing, even those things which seem to be in our own Power^o. And he proceeds to prove the same consequences upon them by other Arguments.

To these I add *Gellius* who tells us, that this was a general Charge upon the Stoicks from all quarters. *Fatum est*, inquit, (Chrysippus) *sempiterna quadam & indeclinabilis series rerum & catena, volvens semetipsa sese, & implicans per*

η Οἱ Στωϊκοὶ φιλόσοφοι — πῶς ἀληθείαι καὶ ΤΟ ΕΦ' ΗΜΙΝ ΑΝΑΙ-
ΡΟΥΣΙΝ. *Nemef.* Cap. 44.

Ο Οἱ λέγοντες, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ΕΦ' ΗΜΙΝ καὶ τὸ ΚΑΘ' ΕΙΜΑΡΜΕΝΗΝ
σώζεται (εἰσὶ δὲ τῶν Στωϊκῶν Χρύσιππος τε καὶ Φιλοπάτωρ, καὶ ἄλλοι
πολλοὶ καὶ λαμπροὶ) οὐδὲν ἔπρεν ἀποδιδικεύουσιν, ἢ πάντα καθ' εἰμαρ-
μένην γίνεσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰς ὁρμὰς παρὰ τῆς εἰμαρμένης φασὶν
ἡμῖν δίδουσι, καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς περὶ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης ἐμποδίζουσιν,
ποτὶ δὲ μὴ, δηλοῦν ὅτι πάντα καθ' εἰμαρμένην γίνεσθαι, ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΔΟ-
ΚΟΥΝΤΑ ΕΦ' ΗΜΙΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ. Cap. 35.

æternos consequentia ordines, ex quibus apta connexaque est. — Aliarum autem Opinionum disciplinarumque auctores huic definitioni ita obstrepunt. Si Chrysippus, inquiunt, fato putat omnia moveri & regi, nec declinarique transcendique posse agmina fati & volumina; peccata quoque hominum & delicta non sustentanda neque condicenda sunt ipsis voluntatibusque eorum, sed necessitati cuidam & instantia quæ oritur ex fato, omnium quæ sit rerum domina & arbitra; per quam necesse sit fieri quicquid futurum est: & propterea nocentium pœnas legibus iniquè constitutas, si homines ad maleficia non sponte veniunt, sed fato trahuntur.

I omit subjoining Hierocles^v, Theodoret^q, and Joannes Sarisberiensis^r, because (tho' I'm firmly persuaded my self, that their Opinion of the Stoicks was the same with that of the others,) they have not expreis'd themselves in so full and indisputable terms.

Now the use of and Inference from so many antient and celebrated Writers is naturally this, that a Modern has very good Rea-

p Ap. Phot. Cod. 214. Τήντι γὰρ τῶν γενεθλιαλῶν αἰλόζειν ἀ-
πύκην οὐδ' ὅλως πρᾶσιται, οὐδ' τὴν ΣΤΟΙΚΗΝ ΒΙΑΝ.

q Therapeut. Sermon. 6, p. 561, 562.

r Polycrat. Lib. 2. Cap. 21. Stoicus omnia necessaria credit,
timens evacuari posse scientiam immutabilem. E contra Epi-
curus eorum quæ eveniunt nihil providentiæ ratione dispo-
situm, ne fortè necessitatem mutabilibus rebus inducat, opinatur.
Pari ergò ratione desipiunt, cum Alter Casui, Alter necessitati
universa subjiciat.

son to charge the *Stoicks* by consequence with a *necessary* Fatality of Human Actions, since the Antients themselves in great numbers pronounc'd as strongly against them, and *none* could venture to acquit them. We certainly now at this Day have a much more imperfect knowledge of the *Stoical* Scheme and Doctrine than the Antients had, and cannot be so well acquainted with the Pleas and Arguments for it, as they were who convers'd and disputed continually with them. We have not in these latter Ages any thing *new* or unheard of before, to palliate and excuse the *Stoical Fate*, which the Antients were never appriz'd of; and if *they* heretofore rejected and confuted the Pleas and Excuses of the *Stoicks* as fallacious and frivolous, what sufficient Ground and Foundation can *we* have to admit and defend them as solid, just, and unexceptionable? This is, I think, Authority enough for *us* to entertain the same Opinion of the *Stoical Fate*, and to pass the same Censure upon it. But to clear up the matter, and to give Satisfaction to scrupulous Persons, I proceed to obviate some few Objections, which are rais'd on the other side.

OBJECT. I.

IT is said, that *Chrysippus* the *Stoick* does not allow his *antecedent Causes* to be *perfect, principal, and effectual Causes* of Human Actions, but moving and *assistant* only.

ANSWER.

A N S W E R.

I grant that *Chrysippus* does make a distinction of this kind, but I must affirm, with very little propriety, and to little purpose. This distinction of *Chrysippus* was known *antiently* as well as it is *now*, but it never had so much Effect upon other Philosophers, as to give them a clear and good Opinion of the *Stoical Fate*. You have seen what *Cicero*, *Plutarch*, *Nemesius*, and others say upon it. They had reasons, no doubt on't, very strong and substantial for not acquiescing in such an Excuse; and *their* Dissatisfaction and Scruple is a very good Argument to *us*, not to admit the same distinction without examining the weight and justness of it. There is in it a great deal of weakness and fallacy, which a little consideration will serve to discover. In order to explain and illustrate his Distinction, *Chrysippus* compares the Mind to a Cylinder, and the influence of *antecedent causes* upon the one, to the Action of a *Vis motrix* upon the other. From whence it is plain, that the Mind accor-

f Ut, inquit, qui protrusit Cylindrum, dedit ei principium motionis, volubilitatem autem non dedit: sic visum objectum imprimet illud quidem, & quasi signabit in animo suam speciem, sed assensio nostrâ erit in potestate; eaque, quemadmodum in Cylindro dictum est, extrinsecus pulsa, quod reliquum est, suapte vi & naturâ movebitur. *Cic. de Fat. Cap. 19. Vid. Cell. Lib. 6. Cap. 2.*

ding

ding to *Chrysippus* is as strongly and effectually mov'd by external *antecedent causes*, as a Cylinder is by *external Force*. The only difference between them is this, that the Mind concurs by assent with external *antecedent Causes*, and the Cylinder is purely passive, senseless, and without Volition. And indeed *Chrysippus* had no other way left to reconcile the τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν with *Fate* and *antecedent Causes*. For if, as *Plutarch* very justly observes, in the place above cited, * the external φαντασίαι order'd and offer'd successively by previous decrees of *Fate*, did not fully and absolutely determine the Mind to produce this or that Action, what then must become of *Fate*, when the Mind can cross and set aside it's decrees? So that tho' *Chrysippus* and other *Stoicks* maintain, that nothing from without can move the Mind, *without* the concurrence of it's own ὁρμή and συγκατάθεσις, yet is the Mind subjected inevitably to *Fate*, if the Objects of *Fate* do absolutely move and govern that very ὁρμή and συγκατάθεσις. Thus delusive and fallacious is *Chrysippus's* Hypothesis; it makes every Man a *really* necessary Agent, and *free* only in imagination; it places the *Faculty* of

* See p. 86.

ἢ Εἰ καὶ ἡ ὁρμή ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἑπακολουθεῖ, πῶς λοιπὸν τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν;
 — εἰ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἑπακολουθεῖ καὶ τὸ ἐρῶν, ὅλον ὡς καθ' εἰμαρμένην
 καὶ τὰ τῆς ὁρμῆς γενήσεται, εἰ καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν γί-
 νεται, καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν φύσιν καὶ ὁρμὴν καὶ κρίσιν.
 — Οὐκ ἄρα τὸ δι' ἡμῶν ὑπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης γιγνώσκον ἐφ'
 ἡμῖν ἐστὶ. *Nemes.* Cap. 35. sub. fin.

Assent

Assent *within*, but the absolute Cause of actual Assent *without*. From whence Oenomaus the Cynick said with an Elegant Sneer of Chrysippus, that he made the Mind of Man ἡμίδουλον^u.

OBJECT. II.

IT is urg'd that the *Stoicks* themselves often declare expressly for the τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, for *Choice*, and the absolute Power of the Soul.

ANSWER.

IT is very true, they often do so. So says *Epictetus*, *some things* are ἐφ' ἡμῖν, *others not*^w. And to the same effect speak *Seneca* and *Marcus Antoninus* in many places. But all this is to be understood in a limited and restrain'd Sense, with reference to the *Stoical System* of Things^x. *Alexander Aphrodisiensis* has given us a full and clear account of the *Stoical* τὸ ἐφ'

^u Χρύσιππος ἡμίδουλον ἐπινόει τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων. *Ap. Euseb. Præp. Lib. 6. Cap. 7. & ap. Theodoret. Therap. Serm. 6. p. 561.*

^w Τῶν ὄντων τὰ μὲν ἐστὶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν. *Enchir. Cap. 1.*

^x Ita nimirum res sese habet, duplici ratione effata *Stoicorum* considerari posse, vel in se, seu extra systema philosophiæ *Stoicæ* spectata; vel prout ex propriis & domesticis philosophiæ illius principiis fluunt ac originem trahunt. Priori modo si quædam considerentur, subinde longè verissima sunt pulcherrimæque; ita etiam comparata, ut nihil minùs; quam *fatum* aliquod *Stoicorum* indicare videantur. Sed si secundum vera & genuina *Stoicorum* principia explices, uti omninò fieri decet, longè aliter se rem habere deprehendes. *Buddæus. Addend. ad Isagog. p. 36.*

ἡμῶν. He tells us, that γ the τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν was sufficiently secur'd by the *Stoical* Doctrine, if Men were left to act according to their *Nature*. And Men were suppos'd by them to act according to their *Nature*, if they did nothing by compulsion *against* their own natural ὁρμὴ & συγκατάθεσις. If their Actions were but ἐκβία, produc'd with their own Will and Inclination, this was enough to make and denominate them *free Agents*, tho' their Wills and Inclinations themselves were govern'd, directed, and determin'd by *external* and *Fatal* Causes.

AND thus they said that inferior Animals had a τὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς as well as Man, because it seems *Fate* did not Act upon *them* with a proper βία as upon things inanimate, but by

γ' Ἀνακρίτης τὸ ἔχοντα ἔχει τὸν ἄνθρωπον ΤΗΣ ΑΙΡΕΣΕΩΣ ΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΑΞΕΩΣ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, λέγουσι ΕΦ' ΗΜΙΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΤΕ γινόμενοι καὶ ΔΙ' ΗΜΩΝ Ἐπεὶ γὰρ φασὶ τῶν ὄντων καὶ γινόμενων αἱ φύσεις, ἐπὶ ταῖς καὶ διαφόραις. — γίνονται δὲ τὰ ἐφ' ἑκάστου γινόμενα κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν φύσιν, &c. — ὅθεν μὲν τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν φύσιν ἐφ' ἑκάστου γινόμενων διαδοῖς φασὶν ἄλλως ἔχειν. Ἀλλ' ἔκαστον τῶν γινόμενων ὑπ' αὐτῶν γίνεται κατὰναγκασμένως, κατ' ἀνάγκην δὲ τὴν ἐκ βίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς μὴ διὰ τὸ μὴ πεφυκός. — ὡς δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀψύχων ἔχει, ὅπως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ζώων ἔχει φασὶν. Εἶναι γὰρ τινα καὶ τοῖς ζώοις κίνησις κατὰ φύσιν. Ταύτην δ' εἶναι τὴν ΚΑΘ' ΟΡΜΗΝ. Ἡ δὲ γὰρ ζῶον ὡς ζῶον κινησάμενον κινησάμενον κατ' ΟΡΜΗΝ κίνησις ὑπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης ΔΙΑ ΖΩΟΥ γινόμενη. Οὕτω δὲ ταῦτα ἰσχύονται, καὶ γινόμενα ὑπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης κινησάμενα καὶ ἐνέργειαν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, τῶν μὲν διὰ γῆς, καὶ ὕδατος, τῶν δὲ αἰθέρος, τῶν δὲ πυρὸς, τῶν δὲ ἄλλου πνέος γινόμενα δὲ πάντα καὶ διὰ ζῶων πιᾶνται εἰς ΑΙ ΚΑΘ' ΟΡΜΗΝ ΚΙΝΗΣΕΙΣ, ταῖς δὲ τῶν ζῶων ὑπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης γινόμενος Εἰς τοὺς ζῴους ΕΙΝΑΙ λέγουσι. — Καὶ ταύτην ἰδὼν αὐτῶν ἢ περὶ τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν διζα, ὡς δὲ εὐρίκειν ἀπει.

Alexand. Aphrod. p. 175.

φαντα-

φαντασίαι or Objects which mov'd their ὁρμή & συγκατάθεσις.. So that in fact and strictness Men and other Animals are not according to this Doctrine the proper *efficient* Causes of Action, but the *Instrumental* only; they do indeed nothing by meer *force* and *without Volition*, their Minds concur and agree to every Action, but they are not properly αὐτεξέστοι *absolutely free* to do either this or that, but *Fate* irresistibly decrees and determines what particular things must be done, and presents such powerful Motives to the Mind, as shall not possibly fail of engaging it's assent and concurrence. *Alexander* therefore does justly wonder at these *Fatalists*, for calling this *Instrumentality* in Man by the name of *Liberty*; which, he says, is the grossest Abuse of words, as well as the greatest Delusion^z.

WE have here then an excellent Key to open the *Stoical System*, and a clear Solution of the high Expressions concerning Human Li-

z Τὸ ἡμέτερον πλέον τι τοῖς ζώοις δίδοναι — — μηδὲν πλέον τῷ ΕΠ' ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ὁρόματις τηροῦντας αὐτοῖς, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ αἰτιατίον, ὡς αὐτῶν ἀπατωμένων διὰ τὴν τῷ ὁρόματις κρινομένην, ἢ ὡς τὰς ἄλλους ἀπειτῶν σφαιρουμένων. Επὶ πύτῃ δὲ, ἐκείνο ἂν πρὸς αὐτῶν θαυμάσειν, πὶ πάθοντις ΕΝ Τῇ ΟΡΜῇ τι καὶ ΣΥΓΚΑΤΑΘΕΣΕΙ ΤΟ ΕΦ' ΗΜΙΝ ΦΑΣΙΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ.—Οὐ γὰρ τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ φαντασίας προσπίσεως εἶναι τι ἐξ ἑαυτῶν τῇ φαντασίᾳ καὶ ὁρμῇ ἐπὶ τὸ φανέν. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν ἂν ἴσως εἴη τῷ ΕΚΟΥΣΙΟΥ κατισκηνουμένης τι καὶ διεικνόν, ἢ μὴ ταῦτον τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνους καὶ τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν. Ἐκείνοι μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἐξ ἐκείνου γινόμενον συγκαταθέσιν. Ἐφ' ἡμῶν δὲ τὸ γινόμενον μετὰ τῆς κατὰ λόγον τι καὶ κρίσιν συγκαταθέσιν· διὸ εἴ τι μὲν ἐφ' ἡμῶν, τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνους οὐ μὴν πᾶν τὸ ἐκείνους ἐφ' ἡμῶν. Id. ibid.

berty in *Marcus Antoninus* and others, which without it are very difficult, and have puzzl'd many Learned Interpreters. Thus when *Epicetus* says, ἐφ' ἡμῖν ὅσα ἡμέτερα ἔσται, ὑπόληψις, ὁρμή, ὀρεξις, ἐκκλησις, he may easily be interpreted consistent with the *Stoical Fate*, by considering how far our Actions are ἐφ' ἡμῖν according to the *Stoicks*. The Actions of the Mind are ἐφ' ἡμῖν in one Sense, as they do not depend upon accidents and circumstances external, like the ἡ κτήσις *Riches*, δόξα *Honours*, and ἀρχαὶ *Power*, but are always with us and inseparable from us as long as we live. Again, they are ἐφ' ἡμῖν in another Sense, because no Power can properly force them, they cannot be ever produc'd without the assent of the inward Man. But still, our Actions may finally depend upon *Fate*, because our ὁρμή itself may be constantly rul'd and directed by *Fatal φαντασία*.

So when *Marcus Antoninus* comforts himself with reflecting, ὅτι ἔξ ἐπὶ μοι μηδὲν πράσσει παρὰ τὸν ἑμὸν θεὸν καὶ δαίμονα. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀναγκάσων τῆτον παραβῆναι^a. There is no necessity of setting *Antoninus* himself at variance with the *Stoical System*, nor of giving this passage up as irreconcilable with the Power of Fate. It is strong indeed, but it may and must be understood in a *Stoical Sense*. It is in my

^a Lib. 5. Sect. 10.

Power, says he, to do nothing against the dictates of my own Mind. For no body can force me to transgress them. Very true! No body and no thing can force you to this, because the Mind is incapable of force and Violence, being according to you of a Substance and Nature Divine. But notwithstanding this, your Fate may invariably rule and direct your Actions, tho' not by a proper βία or Force, yet by constantly moving your Will and Appetition,

I need not take notice of any more Passages of *Antoninus*, because there are none stronger than what I have quoted. I would only give a general caution concerning his Books, that where he magnifies the Powers of the Soul in such bold and extraordinary Terms, he opposes them generally to the external Things and Occurrences of the World, as being not able to assail and hurt the inward Man, whatever they may do with the outward; and that the Good or Evil of things is nothing real, but depends entirely on the Judgment and Opinion of the Mind about them. But all this while he may allow to his *Stoical Fate* its due Powers, and so may be always consistent with the System of his Sect.

THUS also may *Zeno's* words to *Antigonus* be interpreted. Φανερός ἐστὶ μόνον φύσει πρὸς ἐν-

γενναίαν κλίινων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ΠΡΟΑΙΡΕΣΕΙ. You are manifestly inclin'd to greatness of Mind, not only by nature, but also by Choice. Laert. Lib. 7. p. 370.

CHOICE and Election indeed the Stoicks in words did allow, but destroy'd it's Use and Reality, by laying it under the strongest Influence of Fate, and by making it wholly subservient and ministerial to it.

I come now to Seneca, from whom it is very apparent that Human Liberty with the Stoicks was very imperfect and restrain'd, and that Fate did extend it's Influence to Actions as well as to things. He says, *Quid intelligis Fatum? Existimo necessitatem rerum omnium actionumque, quam nulla vis rumpat*^b. Again. *Fatum est, ut hic disertus sit, sed si litteras didicerit; ab eodem Fato continetur, ut litteras discat; ideo discet. Hic Dives erit, sed si navigaverit. At in illo Fati ordine, quo patrimonium illi grande promittitur, hoc quoque protinus Fatum est, ut naviget; ideo navigabit*^c. You see, how manifest it is, that the Stoicks did not exempt Human Actions from the Power of Fate; all which they did, was to shew, that in some degree (which with other Philosophers would be judg'd insignificant) the Liberty of Man or the τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῶν was still preserv'd, notwithstanding the

^b Natural. Quaest. Lib. 2. Cap. 36. Vid. Epist. 16.

^c Ibid. Cap. 38.

mighty Influence of *Fate* upon it. *Seneca* himself a few lines after seems to promise such an Exposition of the *Stoical Fate*, and some Account of Human Liberty^d; but nothing of this kind (that I am aware of) is extant now in his works. What account he would have given of Both, may be probably collected from *Nemesius* and *Alexander* produc'd above.

HAVING obviated these, which are the principal Objections, I need not concern myself much with others of less moment. It is said that the word *ἐμὰν* need not signify *force* or *necessity* of Human Actions. And we are sent to *Chalcidius* and *Nemesius* for another meaning. I answer, that indeed the word *ἐμὰν* does not imply immediately *per se* a *Necessity*, neither did it signify so much among the *Platonists*; but I say, that the *Stoical* Sence and Interpretation of it signified little less than *Necessity*, and there is nothing in *Chalcidius* or *Nemesius* to contradict it, but much to confirm it.

THERE may be other very slight Exceptions to what is here asserted, but they are not material enough to be distinctly consider'd.

I conclude therefore with observing, that although some particular *Stoicks* had advanc'd

^d Ista nobis opponi solent, ut probetur nihil voluntati nostræ relictum, & omne jus *Fato* traditum. Cum de istâ re agetur, dicam quemadmodum *manente Fato*, aliquid sit in Hominis arbitrio. *Sen. Ibid.*

peculiar Doctrines of *Fate*, which might not infer a *necessity* of Human Actions, yet will the Bishop of *London's* Position remain very just and true concerning the *Stoicks* in general. His Lordship says, *that this was the avow'd Doctrine of one famous Sect*; which expressions need not include the Doctrine of every single Man among the *Stoicks*, but of the Generality only. Now the Generality of the *Stoicks* did certainly teach what his Lordship charges upon them. For, as Mr. *Jackson*^e rightly argues from *Plotinus*, *some of the Stoicks deriv'd all things from the first Cause of the Universe, which they said pervaded all things, and not only gave motion to, but was the efficient Cause of every thing, styling it Fate, and the supreme Cause, and supposing it to be itself all things; and that not only all other things which exist, but even the inward Purposes of our Minds also proceeded from the efficient Power of it.* This, "says he, was making no Agent in the World "but God only, and Human Actions to be "nothing but the Operations of God in Men, "actuating them and every thing else as the "Soul does the Body.

OTHERS thought, *that the Circumvolution of the Universe effected all things by it's Motion, and by the Positions and Appearances of the Planets and fix'd Stars with respect to each other, and found-*

^e Defense of Human Liberty &c. p. 153.

ing upon these the Art of Prognostication, would have it that every thing came to pass thereby. Plotinus observes, that this Doctrine attributes nothing to our selves, leaves us like Stones, not as Men, who act of themselves, and from their own Nature.

ANOTHER Notion of Fatality was founded in the Supposition of a mutual eternal Concatenation and Chain of Causes, whereby things posterior always follow those which are antecedent, and are resolv'd into them, as existing by them, and having no Existence without them, and are necessarily consequent to those which precede them.

ALL these several Hypotheses are very current among the Stoicks, and none of the Stoicks are excepted from them by Alexander Aphrodisiensis or Plotinus. Therefore what his Lordship says must without dispute be true at least of the Generality of the Stoicks, if not of all. But indeed I am apt to believe, that upon considering the Stoical System with attention as deliver'd above, any Modern would find it a difficult Task to extricate clearly the most subtle Stoick from a necessary Fatality, and to prove undeniably a Vulgar Error on his Lordship.

IT is farther to be observ'd, that his Lordship introduces the Necessity of Human Actions, only as a sort of Interpretation of the Doctrine of Fate. Such, says he, was the Doctrine of Fate
or

or *Mens* doing every thing thro' *Necessity*. The particle *or* does manifestly shew that this latter Sentence is only an Inference from or explication of the former, a *Consequence* deduc'd from the *Doctrine of Fate*, not the *Doctrine* itself. This is a Difference of Moment; for his Lordship might allow, that the *Stoicks* did maintain in words and profession Human Liberty together with a *Fate* Universal, and yet charge the *doctrine of Fate* universal with a real *Necessity of Human Actions*. And therefore I'm surpriz'd to find *or* unaccountably chang'd into *and* * by his Lordship's adversary, which alters entirely the Turn of the Sentence, and the Terms of Dispute; and renders some Animadversions exceedingly foreign, and frivolous.

I shall only add, that a very Learned Man^f abroad has lately taken the same side of the Question with me against *Lipsius* and others, whose Books on that Subject I have not yet seen; it is very probable that he may have done more Justice both to the Subject and his Lordship, and therefore I would wish the Gentleman on the other side to consult his Treatises for farther Satisfaction.

* Plea for Human Reason. p. 28.

f Conferenda quæ dixi in *Introductione ad Philosophiam Stoicam ex mente Marci Aurelii Antonini Imperatoris*, quæ Imperatoris hujus Libris XII. in Editione quæ *Lipsiæ* an. 1729. 8. prodiit, præmissa est. Et de *Erroribus Stoicorum in Philosophia Morali*. Buddeus. Addend. ad *Isagog.* p. 36.

Primitive Antiquity

Explained and Vindicated.

PART II.

Printed first in MDCCXXXIII.

Primitive Antiquity

Explained.



THE BRITISH MUSEUM

Primitive Antiquity

Explained and Vindicated.

BEING

REMARKS

On a Book intituled,

Christianity as old as the Creation.

PART II.

THE SECOND EDITION.

Δεινὴ τις ἡ κακία, καὶ τῶν θείων ἀμαθία, καταφρονεῖν ὧν ἐκ
ἴδεν, καὶ ἐπισύρειν. Porphyr. περ. αποχ. Lib. 2. §. 53.

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω. Can. Nic. 6.

There is also added a POSTSCRIPT,
Defending JEROM and other Antient Writers
against the Learned MOSHEIM.

L O N D O N:

Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball
in Ave-Mary-Lane. MDCCXLII.

Primitive Antiquity

Explained and Vindicated

BEING

REMARKS

ON

THE



THE

THE

LONDON:

Printed for S. Bland at the British Museum, in the Strand, 1802.

Primitive Antiquity

Explained and Vindicated.

PART II.

IN pursuance of the Method laid down in my former Remarks, I now pass on from *Ancient Frauds*, which have fully been considered already, to other Articles of the Charge, which my Author is pleased to draw up against Primitive Antiquity.

SECT. II.

Of ERRORS.

REMARK I.

The whole Christian World, says he, *for more than the two first Centuries believed the Millenarian Heresy, as it is now call'd^a.* Unhappy Gentleman! always to mistake whenever he meddles with Antiquity! He had read perhaps somewhere, that this *Millenary* Doctrine was

^a Christianity as old, &c. p. 116. Ed. 2d.

current among the Primitive *Fathers*, (that are now extant) and from thence, without ever attending to the Way of Expression, extends it without any Limitation to the *whole Christian World for more than the two first Centuries*. Now this Assertion of his is a gross and palpable Falsity, as appears from the very Confessions of the *Millenaries* themselves. *Justin Martyr*, in his Dialogue with *Trypho* the Jew, tells him, that he *for his Part with many others did* really believe a future (literal) *Millennium*; but that still there were *many Pious and Catholick Christians* that did not. And his Way of Expression is so particular, that it does not make the Numbers of one Party greater than those of the other. Πολλοί, *many*, is equally applied to both Sides, without any Restriction or Enlargement on either. The whole Passage runs thus: *I declared to you before, that I and many others are in this Persuasion (of a Millennium) as you also yourselves do entirely believe that Things will be so; however I signified to you at the same Time, that many who are pure and orthodox Christians believe no such thing*^b. What can be clearer and stronger? The learned Editor observes very justly, *Do-*

^b Ωμολόγησα οὖν σοι καὶ πρῶτον, ὅτι ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ ταῦτα φρονοῦμεν, ὡς καὶ πάντως ἐπίστατε τοῦτο γενησόμενον πολλοὺς δ' αὖ καὶ τῶν καθαρῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς ὄντων Χριστιανῶν γνώμης τοῦτο μὴ γνωρίζειν ἐσήμενά σοι. Justin. M. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 311. ed. Thirlb. p. 243. ed. Jebb.

Erina itaque de Millennio, neque erat Universalis Ecclesie traditio, neque opinio de Fide recepta. Therefore the Doctrine of a Millennium was neither a Tradition of the whole Church, nor a receiv'd Article of Faith*. So says Dr. Cave, He (Justin) confesses that there are many sincere and devout Christians, that would not subscribe to this opinion^d. And Mr. Twells in his excellent Defense of the Book of Revelations has very lately declar'd the same thing^e. It is true some considerable Writers^f have thought this passage of Justin corrupted, and have offer'd conjectures of their own to set it right. But the learned Dr. Thirlby^h and Dr. Whitbyⁱ have both reject-ed and disprov'd their Corrections upon good Authority. For whoever considers the Passage and subsequent Context with care and attention, will find the present Reading (confirm'd by all the MSS. Copies) to be the only proper and true one.

* BEFORE I leave Justin, it may not be amiss to clear up a second Passage of that Writer, which may seem to disagree with the other before quoted. It is in the same Dialogue with Trypho. (p. 246. Ed. Jebb.) But I, says he, and all other perfectly sound Christians believe a resur-

c Jebb in loc. d Life of Just. Mart. §. 22.

e Critical Examination &c. Part 3. p. 49.

f Mede Comm. Apocal. Part 2. Tillotson's Rule of Faith. Part 3. §. 9.

g They would read *τὸν ποτὶ ἡμᾶς* or *ὡς καὶ ποτὶ ἡμᾶς*; &c.

h In loc.

i Discourse of the true Millennium chap. 1. §. 1.

rection of the Flesh; and the Thousand Years (χίλια ἔτη) in Jerusalem after it is rebuilt and beautified and enlarged the Prophets Ezechiel, and Esaias, and the rest acknowledge^k (ὁμολογοῦσιν). Now here if χίλια ἔτη the Thousand Years be refer'd (as they are by some) to ὁπιστάμεθα and the ὀρθογνώμονες καὶ πάντα Χριστιανοὶ the perfectly sound Christians, it will then follow, that according to Justin those who did not believe the χίλια ἔτη were not ὀρθογνώμονες, and consequently, that he could not consistently term those very Persons in the former Passage Christians τῆς χαθαράς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς γνώμης. But to take off any difficulty arising from hence, I answer, that the χίλια ἔτη in this latter Passage of Justin ought to be refer'd to the οἱ Προφῆται ὁμολογοῦσιν, and not to the words preceding; for otherwise the οἱ Προφῆται ὁμολογοῦσιν have no natural Sense and Construction. Even those who give the other Interpretation of the place, are forc'd to make the Grammar intelligible by inserting an ὥς before οἱ προφῆται, which is wholly precarious, and without any Authority from the Copies. What seems to me to have obscur'd the Passage, is a little fault in the Punctuation of it, where instead of a Semicolon or · at ὁπιστάμεθα, there is placed a comma. I am

^k Εγὼ δὲ, καὶ εἰπὺν εἰσιν ὀρθογνώμονες κατὰ πάντα Χριστιανοί, ἔσονται ἀνάστασιν γνήστου ἐπιστάμεθα, καὶ χίλια ἔτη ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἰκοδομηθεῖσιν, καὶ ἡσυχασθεῖσιν, καὶ πλατυνθεῖσιν οἱ Προφῆται Ἰεζεκιήλ, καὶ Ησαΐας, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ὁμολογοῦσιν· ἕτως γὰρ Ησαΐας περὶ τῆς χιλιονταετηρίδος ταύτης· κ. τ. λ.

not the first, that explains the Sentence in this manner. The very learned Mr. *Thorndike* many Years ago directed us to it. *Iustini verba, si legem credendi Catholica Ecclesia communem significarent, difficultatem haberent. Sed nihil tale sonant, si rectè interpungas, & Iustini ἰδιωτισμὸν rectè interpreteris.* — *Idiotica Oratio Iustini ad eosdem videbatur fidem Millenniumi trahere, qui resurrectionem profitebantur. Et ita intelligendus esset, si ὡς οἱ Προφῆται, vel si ἂν οἱ Προφῆται, dixisset. Sed si nihil aliud dicat, quam Prophetas Ezechielem, Esaiam, alios idem agnovisse, nihil aliud dixerit, quam à se & ab aliis ejusdem secum sententia quibusdam, eos hoc dixisse intelligi¹.* Besides whoever looks back to what goes before this Passage, will see that the Persons to whom the Father particularly opposes himself and the true Christians, are some Hereticks, *that deny a Resurrection of the Dead, οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, ἀλλ' ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.* p. 244.

After *Iustin*, *Ireneus* another of the *Millenaries* tells us of some, who *tho' right in the Faith* themselves, yet hearkening too much to the Discourses of Hereticks, were persuaded to reject the literal Millennium, and *allegorize away* those Passages of the Prophets, which were brought to prove and support it^m.

¹ De Fin. Eccl. Controvers. p. 280, 281.

m Quidam ex his, qui putantur rectè credidisse, supergredium-

* UPON this occasion, I cannot but correct a surprising mistake of Dr. Whitby, in translating the last Passage of *Irenæus* in the margin. The Dr. renders it thus. *I am not ignorant, that some among us, who believe in divers Nations, and by various Works, and who believing do consent with the Just, do yet endeavour trans-ferre hæc to turn these things into Metaphors* (Disc. of the Millenn. c. 1.) 'Tis evident, that the Dr. by a strange oversight suppos'd *credentes* and *consentientes* to be Nominative Cases and agreeing with *quidam*, whereas they are manifestly both Accusative and govern'd of *in*. The true sense of all which words is this. *I am not ignorant, that some allegorize these words* (of the Prophet, concerning the Wolf and the Lamb's feeding together) *from their literal meaning, and apply them to Men who being before of a wild and savage Nature are Converted to the Faith out of divers Nations and from various ways of Life, and united in Doctrine and Affection with the Just.* I own, this is rather a Paraphrase than a Translation of *Irenæus's* words; but the Reader I hope, will excuse it, if he finds

ut ordinem promotionis justorum, & modos meditationis ad incorruptelam ignorant. Lib. 5. c. 31.

Transferuntur quorundam sententiæ ab Hæreticis sermonibus, & sunt ignorantes dispositiones Dei, & mysterium justorum Resurrectionis & Regni &c. Ibid. c. 32.

Non ignoro, quoniam *quidam* (still the same Persons mention'd before) hæc (*Isaïæ* sc. 11. & 65. cap.) in feros & ex diversis gentibus & variis operibus credentes, & cum crediderint, *consentientes justis, sentent transferre. Ibid. c. 34.*

that

that a verbal Translation would be very obscure and difficult, and that such a Paraphrase does not misrepresent any part of them, and was necessary to shew the true Scope and Sense of the Original.

THIS, I believe, is sufficient Evidence against our Author's Assertion, that the *whole Christian World for more than the two first Centuries believ'd the Millenarian Heresy.*

BUT to these may be added other antient Testimonies, which as Dr. *Whitby* has accurately traced and examin'd, I'll produce them at length in his words. "It had its rise, says *Eusebius*, from *Papias* a Man of slender Judgment. But the Antiquity of the Man prevail'd with many Ecclesiasticks (of the Church) to be of that Opinion, particularly with *Irenaeus*, and if there were any other of the same Judgment with him. Now he that confesseth that *most* (or a great many rather) of the Ecclesiasticks were of that Opinion, plainly denies that all were of it. He that particularly speaks of *Irenaeus*, adding, *if there were any other of the same Judgment*, seems to intimate they were not many. *Origen* in his *Philocalia* saith, they were only *times some* that held this Doctrine, and that so clandestinely that it had not yet come to the ears of the Heathen. And in his *Prolegomena* to

" the

“ the *Canticles*, that they were only *simplicio-*
 “ *res quidam*. In a word, *Stephanus Gobarus*, in
 “ his account of Opinions in which the Fathers
 “ differ’d from each other, reckons this as the
 “ tenth. This will be more evident, says the
 “ Dr, if it be consider’d, that as the Doctors
 “ of the Church were then of different Opi-
 “ nions, so they were then distinguish’d by
 “ different Names : as they who denied the
 “ *Millennium*, saith *Irenaeus*, attempted to alle-
 “ gorize the places produc’d by others for it,
 “ so had they upon that account the Names of
 “ *Allegorists*; and therefore *Nepos*, a Man saith
 “ *Eusebius* from *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, o-
 “ therwise Orthodox, but a Writer for the
 “ *Millennium*, stil’d his Book ἐλεῖχον τῶν Ἀλλη-
 “ γοριστῶν a *Confutation of the Allegorists*. Ac-
 “ cordingly in *Origen* they who deny the *Mil-*
 “ *lennium* are οἱ τροπολογοῦντες τὰ προφητικά,
 “ they who interpret the sayings of the Prophets
 “ by a trope; and they who assert it, are stil’d
 “ *Solius literæ discipuli*, Disciples of the Letter of
 “ the Scripture only. The first assert, *Horum vim*
 “ *figuraliter intelligi debere*. The Passages which
 “ they produce from Scripture ought to be figura-
 “ tively understood; the other, saith he, under-
 “ stand the Scripture, *Judaico sensu*, after the
 “ manner of the Jewsⁿ.

ⁿ Whitby’s Treatise of the Millen. Chap. 1. Sect. 2.

To all which I may farther observe from *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, that many of the African Churches had never embrac'd this Doctrine, and that *Dionysius* himself by frequent Discourses recover'd many Persons in his Diocese from it°. For he tells us, that this opinion having for a long time spread it self much in those Parts it occasion'd Schisms and Separations of whole Churches. From whence it is plain, that other Churches there were of a contrary Persuasion; it being impossible that Schisms and Separations should subsist without distinct and opposite Parties. Neither indeed would *Dionysius* himself have presid'd with so much Honour and Respect in the See of *Alexandria*, nor would he ever have converted such numbers to his own Opinion, if the Milenary Doctrine had been the current and establish'd Doctrine of the *Christian World*. For every one acquainted with Antiquity must know, how zealous the Primitive Christians were in maintaining Doctrines of Universal Au-

Ο Εἰς τῆς Ἀρσενίου γινόμενος, ἵστα (ὡς οἶδας) πρὸ πολλοῦ τοῦτο ἐπιπόλαζε τὸ δόγμα ὡς καὶ κρίματα καὶ ἀποστασίας ὅλων ἐκκλησιῶν γιγνόμεναι· συγκαλέσας τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διδασκάλους τῶν ἐν ταῖς κώμαις ἀδελφῶν, παρόντων καὶ τῶν βουλομένων ἀδελφῶν, δημοσίᾳ τὴν ἐξέτασιν ποιήσας τὸ λόγῳ προειρησάμενον. — Καὶ τέλος, ὅτι τῆς διδασκῆς ταύτης ἀρχηγὸς καὶ εἰσηγητὴς ὁ καλούμενος Κορακίαν, ἐν ἱππηῶν πάντων τῶν παρόντων ἀδελφῶν ἀμολόγησε καὶ διεμάρτυράτο ἡμῶν, μή τι τούτων προσέξω, μηδὲ διαλέξω περὶ τούτου· μηδὲ μεινῶ, μηδὲ διδάξω, ὡς ἱκανῶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιλεχόντων ἐξημύνθη. τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀδελφῶν οἱ παρόντες ἔχαιρον ἐπὶ τῇ κοινολογίᾳ καὶ τῇ πρὸς πάντας συγκατάθεσιν καὶ συνδικρίσει. *Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 7. c. 24.*

thority, and how vigorous they were in opposing any Persons, who endeavour'd to corrupt or abolish them^p. In truth the *Millenary* Doctrine was abstruse and speculative in its Nature, grounded on one certain Interpretation of dark and obscure Prophecies; and for that reason could never make a part of the common Faith of all Christians, nor meet with universal Esteem and Reception^q.

OUR Author to render the Notion more odious, and add a Sting to his Reflection on the Primitive Christians, informs us that now it is call'd an *Heresy*; by which we are to understand, how fallible and erroneous in fact the Antient Churches were, and how little the Moderns can depend upon their Authority. But I wonder, this Gentleman, who multiplies his References on other occasions, does not give us so much as one, to let us know,

^p Illud hoc loco monendum est, Dionysium Alexandrinum apud Eusebium Hist. Eccles. vii, 23, 24, 25. subnascentem in Aegypto errorem hunc suo tempore suppressisse; tantum abest, ut *universa* tum Ecclesiae sententia fuerit. Nam qui, quae de communione & commercio inter se Ecclesiarum dicta sunt, attendat, is nunquam credat, penes Dionysium vel alium quemvis Catholicae Episcopum esse potuisse, silentio damnasse sententiam, quam reliquae Ecclesiae ad fidem pertinere putarent. *Thorndic. Finiend. Eccl. Controv. p. 183.*

^q Sanè ipsa rei subjectae materies, in Prophetiae hujus interpretatione versantis, satis ostendit, non pertinere eam ad *Regulam Fidei*, communi omnium fide, ad omnium communem salutem tenendae. Quid enim esset *communis Fidei*, si ad eam Propheticae totius Scripturae intelligentia necessaria esset? *Id. Ibid.*

REMARKS.

II

by whom it is now call'd an *Heresy*. I very much suspect that an extraordinary Modesty prevail'd with him to keep us here in the dark. For the Papists, you must know, are the Persons who love to brand the Millennium with *Heresy*, for certain Reasons peculiar to themselves. "I never met, says Dr. *Thomas Burnet*, "with a *Popish* Doctor, that held the Millen-
"nium; and *Baronius* would have it pass for
"an *Heresy*. It was always indeed uneasy, and
"gave offence to the Church of *Rome*, because
"it does not suit to that Scheme of Christia-
"nity, which they have drawn. They sup-
"pose Christ reigns already by his Vicar, the
"Pope; and treads upon the Necks of Empe-
"rours and Kings. And if they could but
"suppress the *Northern Heresy*, as they call it,
"they do not know what a *Millennium* would
"signify, or how the Church could be in an
"happier Condition, than She is. — This
"has made the Church of *Rome* have always
"an ill eye upon this Doctrine, because it
"seem'd to have an ill eye upon *Her*; and as
"she grew in Splendour and Greatness, she
"Eclips'd and obscur'd it more and more;
"so that it would have been lost out of the
"World, if it had not been reviv'd by *some*
"of the *Reformation*^r.

^r Theory of the Earth. Book 4. c. 6.

Now it being not perfectly decent and consistent for one, who is always exposing and detesting the *Papists*, to quote *them* as Authority in any Doctrinal Points, our Author thought it proper, I suppose, to make a Report from *them* without naming of Names.

BUT 'tis necessary in the next place to acquaint the Reader, that the antient *Millennium* of the Fathers, which our Author without any Distinction and Explication calls the *Millenarian Heresy*, was different from the Millennium of the *Jews* and *Cerinthian* Hereticks. The Millennium of these latter^f was gross and extravagant, presenting us with nothing better than an odious Scene of Luxury, Voluptuousness, and Sensuality; whereas that of the former^t, was expected to administer only innocent Pleasures and Entertainments to the Just, by way of Recompence for the Pressures, Hardships, and Miseries, which they once had endur'd upon Earth for the sake of Christ.

^f Vid. Augustin. Hæres. c. 8. Theodor. Hæret. Fab. L. 2. c. 3. Caius ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 28.

^t Eousque Patres, quorum ceteroquin tum *doctrina*, tum *vite puritatis* studium veneramus, prolapsos esse, ut Christo placitura crederent, à quibus, qui & inter Ethnicos saniores erant, abhorrebant, quis sibi persuadebit? Ad Irenæum quod attinet, verum quidem est, quod is chiliafimum *quendam* statuatur; at eum non istius generis, ac ille est, quem *impuris* suis cupiditatibus indulgens sibi finxit *Cerintus*. Buddeus Eccles. Apostol. p. 451.

II.

The Primitive Fathers did not believe a Spirit to be immaterial; but only a thinner sort of Body: And this they did not only apply to the Souls of Men and Angels, but they thought that God himself was corporeal^u. This formal and weighty Sentence is here introduc'd to confirm a very shrewd Remark, which our Author had made a little before, that *the meaning of words is perpetually changing*. His Remark I must own, is very just, but it is not to be prov'd by *these* his Instances of Antient Language, but others which our Author is perfectly unacquainted with. The Critical Reader must smile, I believe, to see an old Story drawn out so gravely, in such an heap of ambiguous and equivocating words. What! is *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis* forgot already? Or how was he answer'd by the *Freethinking* Wits? That the same idle things should start up so soon with a confident Air, and a numerous Train of fresh Paralogisms and Blunders! The Learned *Phileleutherus* inform'd a Gentleman of our Author's acquaintance, that the Fathers believ'd the Attributes of God, his Infinite Power, Wisdom, Justice, and Goodness, in the same extent as we do now; but his Essence (no more than we can now) they could not discover. The Scrip-

^u Christianity as old &c. p. 261, 262. Ed. 8^{va}.

tures, they saw, call'd him Spiritus, Spirit; and the Human Soul Anima, Breath; both which in their Primitive Sense mean Aerial Matter; and all the words that Hebrew, Greek, and Latin of old, or any Tongue now or hereafter can supply, to denote the Substance of God or Soul, must either be thus Metaphorical, or else merely Negative, as Incorporeal, or Immaterial. Farther still, that the very Notion of Body in those early Times was undefin'd and unfix'd and extensive as thing. Nay farther, that Matter it self often signified no more than Body, and both no more than Substance^w. After all this, (which never met with a Reply) we are told now positively, that the Primitive Fathers did not believe a Spirit to be immaterial, but only a thinner sort of Body; and that, this they did not only apply to the Souls of Men and Angels, but they thought that God himself was corporeal. Very Clear and Instructive indeed! while the words immaterial and Body both as ambiguous as Spirit, both capable of an Antient and Modern meaning as well as the other, pass off without any Explanation. So that all which appears at present from the Passage before us, is a low and unedifying Quibble. The Reader, I believe, might excuse me from saying any more to my Author on this head; but as the Subject it self is nice, and Philalæthus was short upon it from a just contempt of his Adversary, I am wil-

ling to examine it a little farther, and to set the whole in a fair light.

THE *Primitive Fathers* &c. says our Author. Would not any one imagine from hence, that all the *Primitive Fathers* were plainly unanimous in believing, that a *Spirit* was *material*, that *God*, *Angels*, and *Human Souls* were all *material*, in the grossest sense of the word *matter*? Nay does not the Truth of our Author's Observation (concerning the different Sense of the word *Spirit* among the *Antients* and *Moderns*) suppose and depend upon it? And yet, I will venture to affirm,

1st. THAT the *Primitive Fathers* distinguish'd between a *material* and *immaterial Spiritus*, as well as the *Modern Divines* and *Philosophers*. The word *Spiritus* indeed among the *Latins*, and πνεῦμα among the *Greeks*, in its primary Use and Grammatical Etymology did always express something *material* in it. But the *Christians* refin'd the Sense of the word, and us'd it often to signify a Substance distinct from and opposite to *Body* or *Matter*. Thus *Origen* delivering the general Sense of the *Christians*, in answer to *Celsus* his *Pagan Adversary*, says. *If God at any time is said to be a Spirit, we do not mean, that he is a Body. For our Spirit (or the Spirit which we Christians speak of) is not a Body. — So that Celsus not understand-*
ing

ing what is said of the Spirit of God, makes his own arbitrary Use and Construction of it, supposing all along that we when we say that God is a Spirit, differ not at all from the Stoicks among the Greeks, who say, that God is a Spirit pervading all things. — Now indeed according to the Stoicks, who go upon corporeal (or material) Principles, even the Λόγος or Word it self of God is nothing else but a corporeal (or material) Spirit. But with us (Christians) who endeavour to shew, that even the rational Soul is superior to every thing corporeal, and a Substance invisible and immaterial, God the Word (Λόγος) can never be a Body^x. So Ammonius^y. God is call'd a Spirit, not as being a Wind, but as an incorporeal and lifegiving Substance. So Didymus^z. The calling God a Spirit, denotes not Wind, but an incorporeal and lifegiving Substance. So among the Latins, Cassiodorus^a a Man of no small

Χ Εὰν λέγηται ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ὁ Θεός, οὐ σῶμα αὐτὸν λέγομεν εἶναι. — Οὐδὲ γὰρ σῶμα τὸ κατ' ἡΜΑΣ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ. — Ως μὴ νοήσας δὴ τὰ ἐκ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Κέλσος — ἑαυτὰ συνάπλῃ, οἰόμενος ἡμᾶς λέγεσθαι ΠΝΕΥΜΑ εἶναι τὸ Θεὸν μηδὲν ἐν τούτῳ διαφέρειν τῷ παρ' Ἑλλήνων Στωϊκῶν, φασκοῦντων ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ἐστὶ διὰ πάντων διηλυγμένος. — Κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς Στωϊκῆς σωματικῆς λέγοντας εἶναι τὰς ἀρχάς — καὶ ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ πνεῦμα σωματικόν. Κατὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν λογικὴν ψυχὴν περιωμένους ἀποδεικνύειν κρείττονα πάσης σωματικῆς φύσεως, καὶ οὐσίαν ἀόρατον καὶ ἀσώματος, ὅτι αὐτὸ σῶμα εἶναι ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος. Cont. Cels. L. 6. p. 324, 325.

Υ Πνεῦμα καλεῖται ὁ Θεός οὐχ ὡς ἀνεμὸς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀσώματος καὶ ζωοποιὸς οὐσία. Caten. in Joan. IV. 24.

Ζ Ο Θεὸς πνεῦμα προσηγορευόμενος ὅτι ἀνεμοὶ ἀλλ' ἀσώματος καὶ ζωοποιῶσαν παρέχουσιν οὐσίαν. Ibid.

a Spiritus nomen generale est incorporalis potentisque Substantie. In Psalm. 103.

Autho:

Authority and Learning assures us, that the word *Spiritus* is a general Name for an incorporeal and powerful Substance. So St. Austin^b. Every Spirit is without doubt of a more excellent Nature than any Body. And again^c. Every incorporeal Being is called in Scripture Spirit, so that this term is applicable not only to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but to every rational Creature and Soul.

I hope the Reader and our Author too are sufficiently satisfied by these few Writers out of many more that might be produc'd, how remarkable an Instance is given us of the change in the Sense of words, that the Primitive Fathers did not believe a Spirit to be immaterial, which is just as true as that our Author is a Critick in Primitive Antiquity.

2d. I will venture to pronounce, that not one of the Primitive Fathers either Greeks or Latins believ'd that God was material^d. There were but two in the three first Centuries Tertullian and Origen, that were ever suspected of favouring such a Norion; and these have been

^b *Spiritus omnis omni est corpore sine dubitatione præstantior.*
De Gen. ad Lit. L. 12. c. 32.

^c Omnis incorporea natura *Spiritus* in Scripturis appellatur, unde non tantum Patri & Filio & Spiritui Sancto, sed omni rationali creaturæ & anima hoc vocabulum congruit. Epist. 238.

^d Deum ἀσώματος esse infinita sunt veterum testimonia. Sui- cer. v. ἀσώματος.

vindicated over and over very fully and solidly^e. *Tertullian* explains very clearly, what he means by his *corpus* or *Body*, when attributed to God; he means his *Substance*. *Ipsa substantia corpus rei cujusque^f*, *The Substance of every thing is its Body*. Again. *Omne quod est, corpus est sui generis. Nihil incorporale, nisi quod non est^g*, *Every thing that exists, is a Body of some peculiar kind. Nothing is incorporeal, but what does not exist. Si habet aliquid per quod est, hoc erit corpus ejus, That by which any thing is or exists, is the Body of it.*

You see in how great a Latitude *Tertullian* uses the word *Corpus Body*, and what an innocent Sense he gives it when applied to God. Neither is *Tertullian* singular in it. *Phabadius* uses the same word with the same kind of Latitude. *Corpus enim Spiritus, sed corpus sui generis. For, says he, a Spirit is a Body, but a Body of a peculiar kind. Nam & invisibilis & incomprehensibilis Spiritus, nunquid tamen & inanis & vacua res Deus? God himself is a Spirit both invisible and incomprehensible; — is he therefore an empty and insignificant Thing? Deus enim est Spiritus, For God is a Spirit^h. Where he manifestly expresses *Substance* by *Corpus*. Neither is this usage*

^e Augustin. Gen. ad Lit. L. 10. Hæres. Cap. 8. Petav. Dogm. Theolog. Tom. 1. L. 2. cap. 1. Huet. Origen. L. 2. cap. 1. p. 30. Origen. cont. Cels. L. 6. p. 323. L. 8. p. 410. ^f Adv. Hermog. cap. 35. ^g De Carne Christi, cap. 11. ^h Cont. Arianos.

of the word peculiar to *Ecclesiastical* Writers. *Cicero* himself has furnish'd them with Authority for it, when he says, that the *Mind* is not *inane nescio quid*, an empty something he knew not what, but in *quodam genere corporis*, a peculiar sort of Bodyⁱ. Many in truth of the Antients signified only by the word *Corpus* a Being or Substance circumscrib'd in Time, Place, and Power, and thereby distinguish'd from the great and supreme God, who was infinitely remov'd from all limitation in either, that is, was according to them *incorporeal* in the strictest and highest Sense. So that nothing can be justly concluded from the word it self, but its meaning must be found from its particular Application and the Tenour of the Place. 'Tis the same with a thousand other words in Antiquity both *Sacred* and *Profane*, and the same exactness and observation, the same Critical Rules are necessary and sufficient for a just Interpretation in both Cases.

OUR Author for his part is resolv'd not to understand the Sense of *Tertullian*, but insists on the Letters and Syllables of *corpus*, let the use and meaning of them be what it will. *Daille*^k is his Oracle here as in other instances, a Guide not always unerring on these occasions. He was a Man of confessedly great a-

i De Finib. L. 4. c. 14.

k De Us. Patr. p. 260.

bilities, and perfectly capable of knowing and judging better, but was carried into violent extremes from Party-Opposition and Prejudice. The *Papists* (it seems) were entirely to be stript of their usual weapons the *Fathers*, therefore *Antiquity* must be strain'd and tortur'd and misrepresented to secure the *Protestants* even from *imaginary* Enemies.

By the same dexterity and management he brings *Hilary* into the Scheme, for no other reason but because he had said with *Tertullian*, *There's nothing but what is corporeal*. This Passage likewise he borrows from Mr. *Daillé*¹, with one improvement, of extending to God Almighty himself, what *Daillé* had more prudently confin'd to *Souls*. *Hilary's* Character in this point has been vindicated at large by the Learned *Benedictines*^m, shewing, as I have done before, that *corporeum* signifies nothing in this place, but a Substance *created* and *finite*. And 'tis very observable, that it's so far from being applied to God, that 'tis expressly attributed to the *Creature* in contradistinction to the *Creator*. *Omne quod creatum est &c. In substantiâ suâ & creatione corporeum*. The words *creatum* and *creatione*, our Author by not consulting or not considering the Original has omit-

¹ Ibid. p 268.

^m In *Hilar. Comm. Matt. cap. 5. Præf. in Oper. Hilar. §. 9.*

P 75.

ted in his quotation from *Hilary*, where we find no more than serv'd the present purpose of deceiving the Reader, *There's nothing but what is corporeal.*

THERE is something indeed, which our Author has started in the Critical way, that may seem to overthrow my second general Assertion, viz, *That no one Father of the three first Centuries believ'd God to be corporeal.* He informs us that *Melito, who was believ'd to be a Prophet, and flourished about 170, wrote a Book about the embodied Godⁿ.* It is very true, there is such a Tract of *Melito* recorded both by *Eusebius*^o and *Ferom^p*; and the Title of the Piece in them is, ὁ Θεὸς ἐν σωματίῳ Θεοῦ. Now this is all that my Author alledges to prove, that *Melito believ'd God himself to be corporeal*, in the grossest sense. The Book it self is not extant, and the Title alone is to shew, what particular Doctrines were contain'd in it! Such Arguments as these I may safely trust with the Reader, desiring him only to consider in a parallel case, whether if in Ages to come nothing more should be preserv'd than the Titles of those three Books, *The Rights of the Christian Church, Christianity as old as the Creation,* and *The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, the most sagacious Critick in the World

ⁿ Christianity as old &c. p. 262.

^o Hist. Eccl. L. 4. cap. 26.

^p Catal. v. *Melito*.

could discover from thence alone the Design and Substance of the Books themselves, and the Sentiments of the *Authors*.

* I must own, two excellent Writers *Valesius* and Dr. *Cave* have suspected from a fragment of *Origen's* and from a Passage of *Gennadius*, that *Melito* was not so sound in this point as he should be. *Valesius* says, *Hoc in Libro* (περὶ ἐσωμάτου Θεῷ) *contendebat Melito, Deum corporalem esse; idque ex variis Scripturae locis comprobabat. Quem quidem Melitonis errorem meritò reprehendit Origenes, in expositione in Genesin, his verbis.* Προδιαληπτόν πρότερον, ποῦ συνίσταται τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα, ἐν σώματι ἢ ἐν ψυχῇ ἴδωμεν δὲ πρότερον οἷς χρῆνται οἱ τὸ πρῶτον λέγοντες ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Μελίτων συληψίματα κατελελοιπὼς περὶ τοῦ ἐσωμάτου εἶναι τὸν Θεόν. Μέλη γὰρ Θεῷ ὀνομαζόμενα εὐερίποντες &c. *qua referuntur à Theodoro in Cap. 20. Quaestionum in Genesin. Eundem Melitonis errorem observat Gennadius in Libro de Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis. Nihil corporeum in Trinitate credimus, ut Melito & Tertullianus. Annot. in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. 4. c. 26. Dr. Cave has these words. Inter opera Melitonis ab Eusebio recensita habetur Liber περὶ ἐσωμάτου Θεῷ. Quid hac Voce intelligendum sit, haud statim constat. Hieronymus Græcam Eusebii vocem retinuit, incertus ut videtur quid sibi voluit. Rufinus vertit de Deo corpore induto, seu ut loqueretur fortasse Tertullianus, corporato. Valesius.*

Iesus reddit, Librum de Incarnatione Dei, *Christophorsonus*, De Deo Incarnato. *Et in hac quidem sententiâ me olim fuisse fateor. Ut verò aliter jam sentiam, facit Origenes Melitoni atate suppar, qui Melitonem iis disertè accenset, qui imaginem Dei in corpore Hominis consistere affirmabant, aitque ipsum commentarios reliquisse πρὶ τῷ εἰσώματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Quin & Gennadius Melitonem & Tertullianum corporeum quid in Trinitate credidisse tradit.* Hist. Litt. Vol. 2. p. 32. Vid. etiam Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Tom. 5. p. 184. Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. 1. L. 2. c. 1. §. 4. Cotelier. in Pat. Apost. p. 738. Ittig. Hæres. §. 2. Cap. 11. Now so far I agree with these Learned Men, that the Title of *Melito's Book* πρὶ εἰσώματι Θεοῦ cannot be render'd with any certainty *De Deo incarnato*; and 'tis possible that *Melito* might attribute something *corporeal* to God. But what he meant by *corporeal*, or whether he spake of God the Father, or God the Son, we cannot collect from *Origen* or *Gennadius*. He might mean nothing more by his *Corpus* when attributed to God than *Tertullian* did, or perhaps he might speak of the Son's appearance in an Human Form before his Incarnation (as many of the Fathers have done), and from thence might assert, that Man was created in the likeness of God with regard to his *Body* as well as his *Soul*. All that *Origen* himself affirms of *Melito*, is only, that he thought *Man* was created κατ' εἰκόνα τῷ Θεῷ with regard to his

Body

Body as well as his *Soul*, which *Melito* might in several Respects, [See *Prudent. Apoth.* v. 1025. *Petar. Dogm. Theol.* L. 2. c. 1. §. 9.] without teaching that God was of a *corporeal* (or *material*) Substance.

BESIDES, it is very plain, that all the Learned Men which I have quoted above, take their whole account of *Melito* from a Passage of *Origen* in *Theodore's Quaestiones* upon *Genesis*, which, I think, may appear to have much less Authority, than they apprehend. It is commonly thought, that the Passage of *Origen* was cited and preserv'd by *Theodore* himself, whereas there is no small reason to suspect, that *Theodore* never gave it a place in his *Quaestiones*. The great *Sirmond*, who publish'd the last and best Edition of *Theodore's Works*, has made some discoveries to us in his Preface, which are so material, that I wonder, they have not been more regarded. He tells us, that in the King's MS. of *Theodore's Quaestiones*, which is a very good and a very antient one, all the Passages now under the names of *Origen*, *Diodorus*, and *Theodorus* are wanting, and that nothing appears there but what is *Theodore's* own. He suspects, that the Person who wrote the MS. which *Picus* follow'd in his Edition of *Theodore*, drew it from some *Catena* or other, where *Theodore's Quaestiones* were intermix'd with Interpretations of other Writers, and among

mong the rest with those of *Origen*, *Diodorus*, and *Theodorus*, and not attending to the Names of different Expositors, confounded several together, and made a mere medley of Comments. That therefore in his own Edition he retain'd indeed the old Interpolations of *Theodoret*, but distinguish'd them from that which is really *Theodoret's*, by prefixing the names of *Origen*, *Diodorus*, and *Theodorus*. His words are these. *De Quæstionibus in Octateuchum, quæ sunt in principio Tomi primi, cum harum exemplar in Bibliothecâ Regiâ Joannes Picus interpres nulum ætate suâ fuisse narret, optimum vetustissimumque in eâ nunc esse, quod nobis non solum Theodoretî præfationem hætenus non editam, cum iis quæ in Pici codice sub finem desiderabantur, exhibuit, sed & alia passim multa vel pleniora vulgatis vel emendatiora subministravit, perturbationemque illam discussit, quæ suspensos legentium animos in Quæstione 20. morabatur. Ubi cum de imagine Dei, quemadmodum accipienda sit, veterum aliquot scriptorum opiniones protulisset & rejecisset Theodoretus, easdem ipsas quas improbat, postmodum asserere & confirmare videbatur; errore, ut apparet, hinc nato, quod cum ex antiquis Catenis, quas vocant, excerptas Theodoretî Quæstiones istas constet, qui codicem, quos usus est Picus, descripsit, cum Theodoretianis sententiis Origenis quoque ac Diodori & Theodori sententias illas quas rejecerat, prætermisiss auctorum nominibus per imprudentiam subjunxit.* Quo

D

prorsus

prorsus mendo caruit codex Regius, qui quod Theodoretum non sit, hoc loco nihil habet. Hunc itaque nos secuti, ea quæ subsequiebantur, sic retinimus, ut Origenis, Diodori, & Theodori prefixis vocabulis, non Theodoretum, sed aliorum esse ostenderemus. Quin & hoc exemplo non modo alia id genus commata, quæ aliis in locis occurrerant, & proprium nomen retinebant, non sustulimus, sed & ipsi nova quadam interdum quæ ad Theodoretum facerent, eodem ex fonte petita, e re tuâ futuram id sperantes, indidimus. Præf. ad Theodoret. Oper. Tom. i. To confirm these Corrections of Sirmond, Picus himself confesses, that the MS. which he made use of was a very faulty and imperfect one. Cum hujus operis, says he, unicum duntaxat exemplar Græcum ab Afulano Veneto nactus essem, ipsumque imperfectum, & in singulis penè paginis mendosum, ita ut inter rejectitios Libros haberetur, illud nihilominus transcribendum curavi &c. Præf. in ejusd. Edit. Græc. From hence there is room for distrusting what is now said of Melito in Theodoret's *Quæstiones*. In Picus's Editions of them, which I have seen, there are no names of Origen, Diodorus, and Theodorus, but four expositions of different Authors are thrown together, and this very account of Melito falls to Theodoret's share. And therefore Sixtus Senensis who had seen no better Edition of Theodoret, says, *Hæc Theodoretus de Melitone refert.* (Biblioth. L. 5. Annot. 18.) Now that Librarian

rian whom we find was so negligent in other respects, might as probably commit mistakes with regard to *Melito*. And 'tis something pretty extraordinary, that *Pererius* quotes a passage of *Melito*, against those Hereticks who made God corporeal, from this very 20th. question of *Theodoret*. *Theodoret*. in quæst. 20. in Gen. laudat *Melitonem* adversus istos hereticos hoc argumento utentem; si propterea existimatur Deus habere corpus, quale habet Homo, quia Scriptura describit eum tanquam instructum & preditum membris Humanis, simili ratione concluderetur, hominem non esse similem Deo, nec ad ejus imaginem & similitudinem factum. Etenim *Zacharias* Cap. 4. describit Deum septem oculos habentem, cum nos duos tantum habeamus; & *Psal.* 90. inducitur Deus habens pennas & alas, quibus nos caremus, & multa alia per metaphoram Deo attribuit scriptura, quæ si propriè & ad veritatem exigerentur Deum facerent enormem atque monstruosum, & longè dissimillimum hominis. Non igitur, ait *Melito*, imago Dei quærenda est in Hominis corpore, sed in animo, qui ut Deus, sic ipse rationis, consilii, & sapientiæ compos & capax est. In Gen. L. 4. p. 117. These words are no where to be found in the present Editions of *Theodoret's* 20th. question, therefore *Pererius* who was a curious and Learned Man must have seen, I imagine, a very different Copy of them.

BUT after all, not to insist at present, either on the doubtfulness of the passage of *Origen*, (which as *Petavius* declares he had seen in a MS. *Catena*, I am willing to allow) nor yet on the blunders of the careless Librarian, I must question the truth of the common Translation of *Origen's* words, and propose another, which makes at least as good Grammar and Sense of them, and gives to *Melito* a Character quite the reverse and more probable. Ὡν ἐπὶ καὶ Μερίτων συγγραμματα καταλειπομένως περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου εἶναι τὸν Θεόν, says *Origen*, Which Sentence may be thus rendred. *Contra quos etiam Melito librum reliquit περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. As if it was read καὶ ὧν καὶ Μερίτων &c. Such ὑπερολογίαι are frequent in antient Writers and well known, particularly with regard to Prepositions. See *Servius* *Æneid.* i. v. 311. *Voss.* Art. Gramm. L. 7. c. 48. And the Business of *Melito's* Book I suppose with *Sixtus Senensis* (*Biblioth.* L. 5. Annot. 18.) might be to confute the Arguments of those, who urg'd the Scripture to prove that God was *corporeal*. The title περὶ τοῦ ἐνσωμάτου Θεοῦ I would understand to mean, *De Deo corpore induto*, sive, *de Deo, cui divina Scriptura corpus attribuunt*. What persuades me very much to chuse this interpretation, and reject the other, is the silence of *Eusebius* and *Jerom*, and the great abilities and Character of *Melito* in the Church. It seems to me quite incredible and unaccountable, that

that a Man so considerable as he was, should teach a Doctrine so gross in itself, and so contrary both to the Doctrine of the Church at that time, and even of the best Heathen Philosophers; and that, if he had publicly taught any such, neither *Eusebius* who has enlarg'd upon his Character in other respects, and given us a list of his Writings, and reckon'd this very Book among the rest, nor *St. Jerom* who was much addicted to censures, should leave so much as a hint of a thing so remarkable.

As to the Book which is commonly ascrib'd to *Gennadius*, it's Authority, I confess, is of very little weight with me, both because the Writer of it is not certainly known, (see *Benedictin. in Append. Tom. 8. Augustin. p. 75.*) and because it gives several misrepresentations of Persons and Things in other instances. To mention but one. He calls *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria Fons Arii*, and attributes such a Doctrine to him with regard to the Trinity, as exceeds all Truth and Credibility. *Nihil creatum aut serviens in Trinitate credendum, ut vult Dionysius Fons Arii. Cap. 4.* This is known to be a groundless aspersion of *Dionysius* from Antients and Moderns.

BUT tho' it were admitted as evidence against *Melito*, yet it is so far from confirming the Sentence of *Origen*, (as it is at present translated and understood) that it directly contradicts

tradicts and overthrows it. *Origen* manifestly ranks *Melito* with those, who attribute an Human Form, Limbs, and Actions to God, because he is thus represented in Scripture. *Genadius* expressly distinguishes him from Men of that stamp, and only joins him with *Tertullian* in ascribing a *corpus* to God, which has been shewn to be innocent and inoffensive. *Nihil corporeum, ut Melito & Tertullianus; nihil corporaliter effigiatum ut Anthropomorphus & Audianus.* Where the latter is the Error which *Origen* opposes and charges upon *Melito*.

These things consider'd, the argument from *Melito* is no better than a broken reed, which peirceth the hand of him that leaneth upon it.

3dly. It is as certain, that a great majority of the *Fathers* are clear and strong for the immateriality of Angels and Human Souls, and very few express against it. First of Angels. Let the *Stoicks*, says *Origen*^p, make their general Conflagration of all things; we (Christians) know that a Substance incorporeal is not subject to Fire, and that neither the Soul of Man, nor the Substance of Angels, and Thrones, and Dominions, and Principalities and Powers can possibly be dissolv'd into it; where he manifestly declares not his own private Opinion only.

ἢ πάντα ῥῶς ὅτι οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοιᾶς ἐκπυρόμενοι ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀνθρώποι
καὶ αἱ ψυχὴν ἐκπυρόμενην, καὶ οἱ πῦρ ἀκαλλυόμενοι τῇ αἰθέρι
ψυχῇ, ἢ τῇ ἀγγελῶν, ἢ θρόνων, ἢ κυριαρχιῶν, ἢ ἀρχῶν, ἢ ἐκτετακτων.
C. Cels. L. 6. p. 325.

but

but the general Doctrine of the Christian Church. So also *Theodoret*^q. *The Angels and Archangels, and all those incorporeal and holy Beings may more properly* (than the Soul of Man) *be called the Images of God, as being entirely free from Body, and preserving their invisible Nature pure and unmixt.* So *Eusebius* calls the Angels, *incorporeal and intelligent Beings, immaterial and absolutely pure Spirits*^r. So *Chrysostom*^t says, *Angels and Archangels, and all other incorporeal Substances.* In short, it was the current Doctrine of Antiquity, with very few indisputable Exceptions to the contrary. Indeed we often find, that Angels are term'd *corporeal*, but in a Sense that does not affect their *Substance*. They are call'd *corporeal*, because they are Creatures finite and circumscribed in their Existence^t, or because they had not

q Μᾶλλον εἰκονες τῷ Θεῷ κληθεῖεν Ἄγγελοι καὶ Ἀρχάγγελοι καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἀσώματοι καὶ ἅγαι φύσεις, ὅτι δὴ πανταπασὶ σωμαμάτων ἀπηλλαγμέναι, καὶ ἀμιγῆς τὸ ἀήρατον ἔχουσαι. Quæst. 20. in Gen.

r Ἀσωμάτους τίνες νοεῖας καὶ θείας δυνάμεις, ἄγγελους καὶ Ἀρχαγγέλους, αὐλάτε καὶ πάντα καθαρὰ πνεύματα. Dem. Evang. L. 4. C. 1. Vid. Præp. Ev. Lib. 7. C. 15. p. 326, 327.

t Ἐποίησεν Ἀγγέλους καὶ Ἀρχαγγέλους, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τῶν ἀσωμάτων ἐσίας. Tom. 1. p. 157. Nov. Edit. Vid. Philopon. in Gen. L. 1. c. 18.

t Sunt enim, qui ipsam corporei & incorporei vim & significationem aliter usurpârunt, ac fert communis usus; atque hoc dici corporeum putârunt, quod utcumque definito in loco continetur, & in eo movetur; aut certè iis ipsis e conditionibus effective

not that Simplicity of Nature which belongs to the Divine Being alone^u, or lastly, because they suppos'd them *cloath'd* with light and thin Bodies, tho' they were not *Bodies* themselves^w. *Great and Learned Men*, says *Fulgentius*, assert that they (Angels) are compos'd of two Substances, that is, of an incorporeal Spirit, and of a Body^x. If our Author, and some others who are too injudicious and inconsiderate, would observe these Distinctions in ancient Writers, they might soon be convinced how small a Number of those venerable Men were rigid *Materialists*.

There was indeed a current Tradition many Ages before the Birth of Christ, that some

festisve corporeum aliquid esse statuerunt. — Qui unum id adfirmant, ob id esse corporeos Angelos vel Dæmones, quia certo ac definito sunt in loco eumque commutant, nihil a posterioribus discrepant, qui puros esse Spiritus illos existimant. Alii, &c. ut infra.

^u Alii *corporeum* id appellârunt, quod etsi *Spiritale* proprie sit, non tamen omnino simplex, sed qualitatibus aliis atque aliis afficitur, quæ naturæ ac substantiæ extrinsecus affusæ ad eam adhærescunt. Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. 3. L. I. C. 3.

^w Ex his colligi videtur, Patres illos, qui Angelos *corporatos* esse crediderunt, præter corpus aliquid corpore præstantius, ac mere spirituale illis attribuisse, ut ex utroque componerentur, corpore ac Spiritu. *Id. ibid. C. 2. Origen may be defended from hence.*

^x Plane ex duplici eos esse substantiâ adserunt magni & docti viri, id est, ex Spiritu *incorporeo*, quo a Dei contemplatione nunquam recedunt, & ex corpore, per quod ex tempore hominibus apparent. Fulgent. de Trin. Vid. Claudian. Mamert. Anim. L. 1. C. 14. L. 3. C. 7.

Angels

Angels to whom God had committed the Care of this lower World, had corrupted themselves with Women in the Antediluvian Times, by assuming a Sort of human Bodies; from whence sprung a mighty Race of Monsters, who became upon their Death a Sett of Evil *Dæmons*. This Notion is mentioned by *Philo* and *Josephus* of the *Jews*, and after them by several *Christian* Writers. But long before them it had been spread among the *Greeks*, as appears from *Alexander Polyhistor**, and likewise among the old *Egyptians*, being deliver'd in their famous *Hermetic* Books, according to *Zosimus* of *Panopolis*†. What might first give Rise to this Tradition, I shall not enquire particularly at present; if the Reader would see a fuller Account of this Story, he may consult *Syncellus*^a, *Joseph Scaliger*^b, *Kircher*^c, *Fabricius*^d. I only mention it here, as that to which our Author alludes in a drolling Parenthesis, (p. 261.) and from whence he could collect most acutely, that the Fathers thought *Angels* mere *Matter*, only a little refined; as if truly of one Side they could *not* suppose those *Angels* *superadding* a Body to a Spirit *immaterial*, or of the other, *could* suppose

* Alexand. Pol. ap. Syncell. p. 32, 33. Ed. Par.

† Zosim. ap. Syncell. p. 13.

^a Syncell. Chronog. p. 11, &c.

^b Scal. in Euseb. p. 244, seq.

^c Kircher, *Ædip. T. 2. Part I. p. 69, seq.*

^d Fabric. Cod. Apocr. Ver. Test. T. I. p. 166, seq.

them to do Things with fine *aerial* Bodies, which require those of *human* Consistence.

As to human Souls, it is clear and notorious, that the general Doctrine of the Church was in Favour of the *Immateriality*, therefore I shall not produce a Multitude of Authorities to prove it. *Origen* assures us expressly, that this was the ἐπικρατῶν λόγος, the *prevailing Doctrine*ⁱ; in another Place, that according to the *Christians*, the *Rational Soul* was superior to every Thing corporeal, and a Substance both invisible and incorporeal^k; and in a third^l, *Celsus* charges us (*Christians*) *falsely*, says he, with thinking there is nothing in our whole (human) Composition better and more excellent than Body. For we (*Christians*) say that a Soul, especially a rational one,

i Ἐτι δὲ καὶ φιλοζῶει ἄνθρωπος, πνεῦμα λάβων περὶ ἐστίμῃς λογικῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς ἐχέουσιν τι συγγενὲς θεῷ. Νοερά γὰρ ἐκότερα καὶ ἀόρατα· καὶ ὡς Ο ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΔΕΙΚΝΥΣΙ ΛΟΓΟΣ, ΑΣΩΜΑΤΑ. Exhort. ad Martyr p. 213. Ed. Westf.

k Κατὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν λογικὴν ψυχὴν πειρωμένους ἀποδείκνυναι κρεῖττονα πάσης σωματικῆς φύσεως, καὶ ἰδίαν ἀόρατον καὶ ἀσώματον, οὐκ ἂν σῶμα ἢ ὁ θεὸς Λόγος. Contr. Cels. L. 6. P. 325.

l Συκοφαντεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς ὁ Κέλσος, ὡς οὐδὲν τοῦ σώματος κρεῖττον οὐδὲ τιμιώτερον ἐν τῇ συστάσει ἡμῶν ἡγουμένους· ψυχὴν γὰρ παντὸς σώματος καὶ μάλιστα τὴν λογικὴν φάμεν εἶναι πρᾶγμα τιμιώτερον· ἢ (leg. ἢ) καὶ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τῆς κτίσαντος ψυχῆς μὴ χωρεῖ, οὐδ' αὖτως δὲ τὸ σῶμα· οὐδε γὰρ καθ' ἡμᾶς σῶμα ὁ θεός. Id. ibid. L. 8. p. 409, 410.

is a thing far more excellent than all Body. Inasmuch as the Soul is capable of bearing the Image of its Creatour, but not the Body by any means. For God according to the Doctrine of us (Christians) is no Body. The same Origen indeed in other places speaks of something corporeal^m about the Soul, but it is in those Books where Origen's genuine Sentiments are least to be found; and besides the *corpus* he speaks of, is not the Substance itself of the Soul, but it's *indumentum*, it's cloathing or vehicleⁿ. Again. Why was it observ'd as something particular in *Tertullian*^o, that he made the Soul *material*, if that had been the current Doctrine of the Church? Why did *Claudianus Mamertus* oppose *Faustus* Bishop of Riez in France, with so much vehemence and Learning in three excellent Books^p, if *Faustus* had taught nothing more than was *Catholick*? why does he call his Doctrine of the *materiality* of the Soul a *new Doctrine*^q, and a

m Vid. Huet. Origenian. L. 2. p. 99.

n Materialis substantia hujus mundi — *Spiritalis corporis indumentis* vel Angelos Dei, vel Filios Resurrectionis exornat. L. 2. πρ. ἀρχῶν. C. 2.

o *Tertullianus*, sicut scripta ejus indicant, animam dicit immortalem quidem, sed eam effigiatum corpus esse contendit. *August.* Hæres. 86.

p De Statu Animæ. L. III.

q *Novum* Dogma miramini. L. 2. C. 9. *Novelli* hujus Schismatis Dogma. *Ibid.*

new Schism? Why does *Fulgentius*^r assert the *Immateriality* of the Soul to be the *Catholic Faith*? Or, how is it credible that *all* the Fathers, who censur'd and corrected the Philosophy of *Plato*, should yet have lower Notions of the Human Soul, than *Plato* himself and his Disciples^r? Just therefore and true is the remark of the Noble and Learned *Barthius*, *Animam incorpoream credebatur communiter Ecclesia, & ita omnibus rebus ignobilioribus ob corporum molem, aut quempiam locum, localitatemque eam cum beatis Spiritibus eximebat^r*. The Church did generally believe the Soul to be incorporeal, and thus distinguish'd it together with the Blessed Spirits from all things, which by reason of the bulk of their Bodies, and their filling of Space were of a low and ignoble kind. Are not these now surprizing Instances of the change in the sense of Words?

Egregiam verò laudem, spolia ampla——

^r Sit ergo nobis sine dubitatione compertum, quod Catholica fides & credit & prædicat, Animam scilicet Humanam Spiritum rationalem esse, non Corpus. Prædest. & Grat. Lib. 3. C. 20.

† Κοινὴ μὲν πρὸς πάντας τὰς λέγοντας οὐμὴ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀρκεῖται πρὸς Ἀμμωνίου τῷ Διδασκάλῳ Πλωτίνῳ καὶ Νουμανίου τῷ Πυθαγορείου εἰρημῶνα. Nemes. Nat. Hom. C. 2. p. 41. Ἡ ψυχὴ οὐκ ἔστι ἀμεγέθης, ἀλλ' αὖθις, ἀφθαρτῶς. Porphy. Sentent. 18.

‡ Ad Claud. Mamert. L. 1. C. 1.

SECT. III.

OF ANTIENT SUPERSTITION.

REMARK I.

*The Superstitious every where think, the less Mercy they shew to their Bodies, the more Mercy God will shew to their Souls. Many of the Primitive Christians, instead of flying as the Gospel directs, not only ran voluntarily to Execution, but provok'd the Judges to do them that Favour. And under Trajan, all the Christians in a City of Asia came in a Body to the Proconsul, and offer'd themselves to the Slaughter, which made him cry, O! ye unhappy People, if ye have a mind to die, have ye not Halters and Precipices enough to end your Lives, but ye must come here for Executioners? And this was a general Practice under the Antonini, and Marcus Antoninus severely reflects on the obstinacy of the Christians, in thus running headlong to Death^u. Here are some remarkable Instances of our Author's Conduct, Candor, and Modesty. He would not in direct and express terms call the *Primitive Martyrs*, who ran voluntarily to Execution, those silly superstitious Creatures, that think the less Mercy they shew to their*

^u Christianity as old &c. p. 76, 77. Ed. 2d.

Bodies, the more Mercy God will shew to their Souls. No: even a *Deistical* Assurance, as great as it is, was scrupulous of venting such offensive Scurrilities with a bold and open Face in a *Christian* Kingdom. But so very artfully and industriously has he connected the *Primitive Christians* with the *Superstitious* immediately preceding, that the Reader cannot possibly avoid concluding, that the *latter* are here introduced with no other view than to be Instances of the *former*. This must be allow'd to be excellent Contrivance; and as the Design is very visible, so I cannot but consider what he says of the *Primitive Christians* in this Light.

But 2dly, his *Candour* and *Modesty* are very conspicuous, in citing the *Pagans* the most *Bigoted* Creatures alive as witnesses in the Case, against Men the most sincere and zealous Defenders of Truth and Purity, that ever appear'd among Mankind. This shews exactly the Man and his Principles. These *Martyrs* died not for *Deism* but *Christianity*, therefore they are very *Superstitious*. The *Pagans* are joint Enemies *with Him* to the *Christians*, therefore they are very sensible Men, and proper Evidence for him. No matter for all the heroical and amiable Qualities, which so eminently distinguish'd these *voluntary* Martyrs; they unhappily engag'd in a Cause which my Author does not like, and therefore their Sufferings were mere *Superstition* and silly Precipitancy.

cy. Nay perhaps, such different Effects may they produce in different Ages, that *now* they deter *Him* and *His* as much from the *Christian* Religion, as they *antiently* perswaded Men into it.

AFTER this Introduction, let us now examine the *Crime* of those *Primitive Christians*, who *voluntarily offer'd themselves for Execution*. Our Author insinuates, (as I have shewn above) that they acted in this violent manner from gross *Superstition*, from a strange extravagant Notion, that the *less Mercy they shew'd to their Bodies, the more Mercy God would shew to their Souls*. Insipid Drollery and Falshood! I challenge him to produce a single Instance in all *Primitive Antiquity*, of any one *Martyr* that died upon such a Principle. Whatever was the Motive or Principle, which made the *Primitive Christians* so regardless of their Lives, and desirous of Execution, it certainly was not *Superstition* in any shape. There were other and higher Causes, which are still upon Record, of their wonderful Boldness and Constancy in those times of Affliction. *Many* were excited by a strong divine impulse to offer themselves for Martyrdom. *It was plain to all People*, says Athanasius^w, *that their Rea-*

^w Τίνας ἐξ αὐτῶν αὐτοῖς προσήρχοντο τῆς δίκης, καὶ τοῦτο οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἔπραττον, ἰμαρτύρουσαν γὰρ εἰδὼς, καὶ πᾶσι ἐξήνιτο φανερόν, ὅτι παρὰ πνεύματος ἦν καὶ αὐτῶν ἡ προθυμία, καὶ ἡ πᾶσιντι πρόσδεξις.
Apol. pro Fug. c. 22. ed. Ben.

diness and Eagerness to suffer, proceeded πνεύματος from the Spirit. Others were admonish'd by Signs, and Visions, and Revelations of approaching Persecutions, and the share which they were appointed by God to bear in them. This rais'd in them an *Hungering and Thirsting* after Martyrdom, being from hence assur'd both of the special Favour and Assistance of God in their present Sufferings, and of a glorious and eternal Recompence hereafter. All were animated with these general considerations, that as Jesus himself had in the Gospel encourag'd his Disciples to *take up his Cross and follow him*, and had promis'd such ample rewards to those who should *confess him before Men*, he could not be displeas'd with the strongest Expressions of Vir-*

x Martyres de instante periculo monebat numen signo aliquo prævio, *Revelatione* plerumque divinâ. Ita intelligebant nihil fore in futurâ passione *fortuitum*, nihil hostium odio tribuendum, sed verò providentissimo Dei *consilio*, omnes *confessionis* eventus ab eo administrari. — Intelligebant nihil sibi fore in eâ persecutione *metuendum*, quæ tota à benevolentissimi Numinis nutu penderet, nec sibi nociturum, sed verò maximum potius in *lucrum* cessurum, si se totos Deo ejusque providentiæ *summâ cum fiduciâ* commississent. Intelligebant *honoris* loco habenda esse omnia illa *patientia* exercitia, cum quos revelationibus dignaretur Deus, eorum patientiam ita probandam esse statueret atque exercendam, & *majora* sibi destinari *præmia*, quo graviores decernerentur in futurâ persecutione dolores. Intelligebant nec esse quod de suâ essent futurâ *perseverantiâ* solliciti; qui enim *futuras persecutiones* decrevisset Deus, illum suis nec in *eventu* defuturum, nec dolores permissurum eorum viribus *impares*. — Intelligebant denique id sibi unice curandum, ut Deo se totos crederent, de *eventu* sub ejus administratione planè *securus*. Dodwell. Dissert. Cyprian. 12. c. 39.

true, and Faith, and Love, especially at a time when the more zealous and intrepid they behav'd themselves, the more Credit they should gain to their Friends, and make stronger Impressions on their Enemies. The Conjunction it self was particular, such an one as the World had never seen before, nor ever was to see again. A Religion was to raise and propagate and establish itself among Men, not by Power, Violence, and Oppression, but by the Miracles attending it, and the invincible Patience of it's Professors. And in this Case, they might well imagine, that no instance of Fortitude and Sincerity could be too great, and that courting and solliciting Execution was more noble and praise-worthy than expecting it. Not that they ever thought, that *external* Severities and Sufferings *alone* were requir'd and rewarded by God. 'Twas the Virtue ^a and Piety *within*, the steady adherence to the Worship of the true God, and to Faith in *Jesus Christ*, which, they knew, would entitle them to Crowns and Glories incorruptible. The *external* sufferings themselves were no farther meritorious and acceptable, than as they were *real* and publick

^a Robur pectoris vestri, & perseverantiam fidei quo præconio vocis exornem! — pari ac simili calore Virtutis ad gerendum certamen animatos, sicut esse oportet in divinis castris milites Christi, ut *incorruptam fidei firmitatem* non blanditiæ decipiant, non minæ terreat, non cruciatus ac tormenta devincant. Cyprian. Ep. 10. ed. Oxon.

Expressions of inward Holiness. And that which added strength to their Resolution, and gave a Spur to their Courage, was the visible Assistance and Favour bestow'd upon these Martyrs from above, relieving the Pains in some; extinguishing them in others, and converting them into Pleasure and Rapture in many. Besides this, their *Passions* were frequently honour'd with extraordinary Miracles, which struck astonishment and terror into the *Pagans*, and gain'd wonderful Success and Reputation to the *Christian* Name. These are Facts well known^b and well attested, so plain and indisputable, that I need not take the trouble of proving them. Where then was the Folly and *Superstition* of thus *voluntarily running to Execution*? 'Twas not owing to Enthusiasm, or Fanaticism, or any false Notions, but to an ardent Desire of proving a sincere Faith, of confounding the *Pagans*, and of meriting a Crown that never fadeth in another World. If this was *Superstition*^c, even Virtue and Religion itself may be term'd so. I do not deny in the mean time, that such a Behaviour might in some *Persons*, and at some particular *Times* be very imprudent and culpable. If the Persons were of so much Use and Eminency, that the saving them for a time might be of great advantage to the

^b See *Dodwell. Dissertat. Cyprian. 12. c. 44.*

^c See *Pearson. Vindic. Ignat. Part. 2. c. 9.*

Church; or if their abilities were not strong enough to bear the Shock and Brunt of a Persecution, then it was proper and adviseable to flee from afflicting Tryals and Tortures. Such Limitations as these the Antients themselves^d prescrib'd and follow'd. But here we may observe, that particular *circumstances* rendered such a Boldness improper and blamable, not the *absolute* nature of the Thing itself. The Practice in general was laudable and glorious, as it clearly proceeded from excellent Principles, and produc'd very excellent Effects; tho' in some assignable Cases, as it frequently happens in Cases of Morality, the *Person*, or the *Time* may make it not expedient and eligible.

But the Gospel, says he, directs otherwise. Mere Farce and Burlesque for *him* to talk of the Gospel, who thinks the Gospel itself a Volume of *Superstition*, and laughs at those who believe it. But what says the Gospel? Why in *Matt.* 10. 23. *Jesus* commands his twelve Apostles, *when they are persecuted in one City, to fly into another.* But that Command of our Saviour's was occasional and temporary in it's nature, not necessarily extending to *any* besides the twelve Apostles, nor to them *universally* during the *whole* course of their Lives and Mi-

^dSee *Cass's* Primit. Christian. Part 2. c. 7.

nistry. The Apostles in particular were commanded to fly for a certain Season, because they were to preach the Gospel through *Israel*, and for this End a peculiar Providence conducted and protected them several Years from Violence and Death. The same Apostles were charg'd not to go into the *way of the Nations*, and *not to enter into a City of the Samaritans*^e. Were they never therefore to preach to the *Gentiles* and *Samaritans*? Yes certainly. And accordingly we find St. Paul declaring to the *Jews*^f, that *it was necessary the word of God should first have been spoken to them, but seeing they put it from them, and judg'd themselves unworthy of everlasting Life, the Apostles turned to the Gentile*. So likewise we know, that the same St. Paul, who before had submitted to make his escape, resolv'd at last, notwithstanding the discouraging Prophecy of *Agabus*, and the earnest entreaties of his Friends against it, to go up to *Jerusalem*, speaking these memorable words to the crowd about him, *I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus*^g. This was sure an *Exception*, if not a *Contradiction* to the precept in St. *Matthew*; but far from being Criminal, because by this time the former Injunction had lost its Force and Obligation, the particular Ends and Reasons of it ceasing. No one has examin'd and explain'd

^e Ibid. v. 5.

^f Acts. 13. 46.

^g Acts. 21. 13.
this

this matter better than *Tertullian*; his Arguments and Observations upon it are so very solid and judicious, that I cannot omit inserting them in the Margin^h.

^h *Nolunt intelligere sensum Domini illius pronuntiationis, ut eâ ad velamentum timiditatis suæ utantur, cum & personas suas habuerit & tempora & causas. Cum cœperint, inquit, persequi quos, fugite de Civitate in civitatem. Hoc in personas propriè Apostolorum, & in tempora, & in causas eorum pertinere defendimus, sicut præcedentes & subsequentes sensus probabunt, qui nonnisi in Apostolos competunt. In viam nationum ne ieritis, & in civitatem Samaritanorum ne introieritis: sed ite potius ad oves perditas domus Israelis. Nobis autem & via Nationum patet, in quâ & inventi sumus, & usque in finem incedimus; & nulla Civitas excepta est, quâ per totum orbem prædicamus: sed nec cura nobis Israelis adjuncta est extra ordinem, nisi quâ & omnibus gentibus prædicare debemus. Etiam si apprehendamur, non in concilia eorum perducemur, nec in Synagogis eorum flagellabimur, sed Romanis utique potestatibus & tribunalibus obijciemur. Sic igitur & fuga præceptum Apostolorum conditio desiderabat, quoniam primo prædicandum erat ad oves perditas domus Israelis. Ut ergo perficeretur prædicatio, apud quos priores perfici oportebat,—ided illis fugere tunc ad tempus præcipit, non propter eludendum periculum proprio nomine persecutionis, (atquin persecutiones eos passuros prædicabat, & tolerandas docebat) sed propter profectum annuntiationis, ne statim oppressis Evangelii quoque disseminatio perimeretur. (f. opprimer.) —Denique non consummabitis, inquit, civitates Israelis. Adeo intra terminos Judææ præceptum fuga continebatur. Nobis autem nulla Judææ præfinitio competit prædicationis, in omnem jam carnem effuso Spiritu Sancto. Itaque Paulus & Apostoli ipsi memores præcepti Dominici contestantur illud apud Israël, quem jam doctrinâ suâ impleverant, Vobis oportuit in primis Sermonem Dei tradi. Sed quoniam repulistis eum, nec dignos vos eternâ vitâ existimastis, ecce convertimus nos ad nationes. Atque exinde conversi & ipsi sicut antecessores instituerant, in viam Nationum abierunt, & in civitates Samaritanorum introierunt, ut in totam scilicet terram exiret sonus eorum & in terminos Orbis voces eorum. Si ergo cessavit exceptio via Nationum, & introitus in civitates Samaritanorum, cur non cessaverit & fuga præceptum pariter emissum? Denique ex quo saturato Israeli Aposto-*

It is true, the precept in St. *Matthew* has been alledg'd by some Antientsⁱ to excuse a retreat and flight in time of persecution. This was urg'd in Opposition to those, who would not allow such a flight and retreat on any occasion to be *lawful*. But 'tis one thing to say, that the Gospel *commands* or *directs* us to fly, *whenever* we are persecuted; and another thing to say, that the Gospel *allows* a flight in some *particular* Cases. By this Distinction, the Courage and Resolution of the Martyrs was not less agreeable to the Gospel on one hand, than the flight of St. *Cyprian* and *Athanasius* was to the same Gospel on the other.

I have said thus much in Defence of the Primitive Martyrs, because their Memories as *great* and *good* Men are or ought to be dear above all others to every true Christian, and are not to be vilified with rude and impudent Aspersions of ludicrous *Freethinkers*. I shall only observe, that *Superstition* is a word

li in Nationes transferunt, nec fugerunt de civitate in civitatem, nec pati dubitaverunt. Atquin & *Paulus* qui se per murum concesserat expediri de persecutione, quâ ad hoc tempus erat præcepti, *idem* jam in clausulâ officii &c.—Igitur, cum etiam sub Apostolis ipsis *temporale* fuit *fuga* præceptum, sicut & reliquorum præscriptorum, non potest apud nos perseverare quod apud doctores nostros concessavit, etsi non propriè apud illos fuisset commissum; aut si perseverare illud Dominus voluit, deliquerunt Apostoli qui non usque in finem fugere curaverunt. De Fug. c. 6.

i Vid Athanas. Apolog. pro Fug. c. 11.

of

of excellent use with these Gentlemen, which serves them upon all occasions, against all *Persons, Practices, and Doctrines*, that do not agree with their *System*. 'Tis only crying out *Superstition*, and immediately *Facts* are destroy'd, *Principles* perverted, *Churches* overthrown, and *Freethinking* Orthodoxy. Nothing can stand against this formidable battery, it beats down Enemies, and protects Friends, and is a perfect *invincible Armada*.

II.

* *When by the Empire's becoming Christian, the Crown of Martyrdom was no longer to be obtain'd by the prevailing party of Christians, then exercising Cruelties on themselves was esteem'd the next best thing; and many devotees put monstrous Hardships on themselves, while others chose Poverty, Rags, and Nastiness; or else, retir'd to Caves, Desarts, and other solitary Places to sigh away their miserable Lives. All that I can gather from hence, from the hard Expressions, Cruelties, monstrous Hardships, and miserable Lives is this, that our Author has no Opinion of Mortifications, Self-denials, retirements from the World, from the Cares, Sollicitations, and Allurements of it. He may think so, if he pleases; and we see, that his Virtue and Religion is very secure and perfect without such Restraints and Assurances. But why must he lash and ridicule in such*

* *Ibid.* p. 77.

rude

rude and uncharitable Terms, the Austerities of the *Primitive* Christians? *Primitive*, I say, for I have nothing to do with the corrupt and hypocritical Practices of later Times. The *Antient* Christians intended such severities for the best and most excellent Purposes. They us'd them as means to subdue inordinate Passions, to wean their Minds from a vicious affection for, and attachment to the things of the World, and to guard their Virtue and Piety from the Power and Pleasure of Sin. They plac'd no merit in the *opus operatum*, in the bare *Severities* themselves, neither did they approve them upon any other account, than as they tended to advance Religion and Morality. This was not *Popery*, as our Author may imagine, nor any thing ally'd to it. Many learned and judicious *Protestants* have shewn the contrary at large. Indeed if we consider the State and Opinions of those times, we shall see little reason to censure the Rigours of the *Christians*, and much to applaud them. Christianity struggl'd at that time with two very great and invidious Enemies, *Jews* and *Pagans*. Both these esteem'd it the very *Apex* of Philosophy, and the highest ornament of their Profession, to mortify the *Body*, and to purge and disengage the Soul as much as possible from the Passions and Affections of it. And their way to effect this, was to exercise (what our Author calls) *Cruelties* and *Hardships* upon them.

themselves, to choose Poverty^k, and a mean Habit, and to sigh away their Lives in a miserable Solitude. This was the Doctrine and Practice of the *Essens*^l among the *Jews*, and of the *Pythagorean*, *Platonick*, and *Stoick* Philosophers^m among the *Pagans*. This was the *ἀσκησις* which gain'd them Admiration and Re-

^k Εγκράτιαν ὅσπερ πῖνα θιμείλιον προκαταβαλόμενοι τῇ ψυχῇ τῆς ἄλλας ἐποικηδονῶν ἀρετῆς. Philo Jud. Vit. Contemplat. p. 894. Ὅταν ἐκώσῃ τῶν ἐσίων, ἵτω' ἐδινός ἐν διλειζόμενοι φεύγουσιν ἀμειψέ-
 ρεπτὴ καταλίποντες ἀδελφούς, τέκνα, γυναῖκας, γονεῖς, πολυαιθρώπους
 συγγείας, φιλικὰς ἐπιχειρίας, τὰς πατερίδας, ἐν αἷς ἐγνηθήσαν καὶ
 ἐτρέφθησαν, ἐπειδὴ τὸ σὺνθεῖς ὀλκὸν καὶ διλειώσῃ δυνατώτατον — τειχῶν
 ἔξω ποιῶνται τὰς διατελέας ἐν κήποις ἢ μοναγρίαις, ἐρημίαν μεταδι-
 ὁκοῦντες. Id. p. 892. Σιτῶνται πολυτιλὰς ἐδὲν, ἀλλὰ ἄρτον εὐπλῆ, &
 ὅσον ἄλλες, ὅς οἱ ἀεροδιαίτατοι παρατεύουσιν ὑσώπων, ποτὸν ὕδωρ
 μαμαπαῖον αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν ὅς γὰρ ἡ φύσις ὑπέστη τῷ θνήσκῃ γίνεαι δι-
 σποίνως πείναντι καὶ δίψῃ, ἀπομειλίωσονται, τῶν εἰς ἡδονὴν ἐπιφί-
 ρεσις ἐδὲν, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ χρησιμὰ, ὧν ἄνεν ζῆν οὐκ ἔστι. — περὶ μὲν
 οἰκίας εἴρηται πρότερον, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀκαλλώπητος καὶ αὐτοσχιδίας, ὥστε τὸ
 χρειώδες αὐτὸ μόνον εἰργασμένη καὶ ἰοδὴς δι' ομοίως εὐπλεστώτη, πρὸς
 ἀλέχημα κρυμῆται ἐν θάλασσῃ. p. 894, 895.

^l Joseph. Ant. L. 18. c. App. L. 2. Porphy. ἀποχ. L. 4. §. 11.

^m Τοῖς σπουδαίοις ἡ ἀποχή μᾶλλον οἰκειότερα καὶ βρωτῶν καὶ τῶν διὰ
 σώματος ἀπολαύσεων καὶ πράξεων τῆς ἐφάρψιας. Porphy. περ. ἀποχ.
 L. 1. §. 45. Τί δὲ ἰδοὶ καὶ μαρτυρεῖν τὰ πάθη, ἐκ ἀποθήσκων ἀπ' αὐτῶν,
 καὶ τοῦτο μελετᾷ καθ' ἡμέραν, εἰ οἶον τ' ἢ ἐν ἐργεῖν ἡμᾶς κα-
 τὰ τὴν ὥσιν τὰ θνητὰ συαπτομένους; Id. ib. §. 41. Ὅση δύνα-
 μεις, ἀποστατέον τῶν πλείων χωρίων, ἐν οἷς καὶ μὴ βολόμενόν ἐστι περι-
 πτεται τῷ πλήθει, καὶ εὐλαβεῖται τὴν ἐν τῇ πείρῃ μαχίαν. Id. ib. §. 35.
 Ὅντα καὶ τὰν πρόδιν ἀκόμενι κλῖα ἀνδρῶν Πυθαγορείωντι καὶ
 σφῶν ὧν οἱ μὲν τὰ ἐρημέστωι χώρῃ κατᾶκον· οἱ δὲ καὶ τῶν πόλεων
 τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ τὰ ἄλσθη, ἐξ ὧν ἡ πᾶσα ἀπλήλαται τύρῃ. — Ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ
 ἐφθαλμῶν σὺν ἐφείσαντο, πόθω τῆς ἰδὸν ἀπερισπάστου θεωρίας. Ἐπὶ
 οἷσις οὖνται συνανθραπύων ἐν ἐμπιπλῇ τὰς αἰσθήσεις τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς
 πάθων αὐτοῖς μένειν ἀπαθῆς, λήθησιν αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν πειθομένους
 ἡπατῶν. Id. ibid §. 36.

Inimica est multorum conversatio. Nemo non aliquid nobis
 visum aut commendat, aut imprimit, aut nescientibus allinit.

G

verence

verence among Princes, Quality, and Populace, and to them it was an Honour and Treasure as valuable as a Robe or a Diadem. Now, I ask, how were *Christians* to behave in these circumstances? Were they, who pretended to preach a Religion and System of Morality more pure than had ever appear'd in the

Utique quo major est populus cui commiscemur, hoc periculi plus est. — Subducendus populo est tener animus, & parum tenax recti; facile transitur ad plures. *Socrati, Catoni, & Laelio* excutere mentem suam dissimilis multitudo potuisset; adeo nemo nostrum, qui cum maximè concinnamus ingenium, ferre impetum vitiorum tam magno comitatu venientium potest. Unum exemplum aut luxuriæ aut avaritiæ multum mali facit: convictor delicatus paullatim enervat & emollit: vicinus dives cupiditatem irritat: malignus comes quamvis candido & simplici rubiginem suam affricuit. Quid tu accidere his moribus credis, in quos publicè factus est impetus? *Senec. Epist. 7.* Hanc sanam & salubrem formam Vitæ tenere memento, ut corpori tantum indulgeas, quantum bonæ valetudini satis est. Durius tractandum est, ne animo malè pareat; cibus famem sedet, potio sitim extinguat, vestis arceat frigus, domus munimentum fit adversus infesta corpori. *Id. Ep. 8.* Multi Philosophorum reliquerunt frequentias Urbium, & Hortulos suburbanos, ubi ager irriguus, & arborum comæ, & susurrus avium, fontis speculum, rivus immurmurans, & multæ oculorum auriumque illecebræ, ne per luxum & abundantiam copiarum animæ fortitudo mollesceret, & ejus Pudicitia constupraretur. Inutile quippe est crebrò videre, per quæ aliquando captus sis; & eorum te experimento committere, quibus difficulter careas. Nam & *Pythagoræi* hujuscemodi frequentiam declinantes in solitudine & desertis locis habitare consueverunt. *Platonici* quoque & *Stoici* Templorum locis (l. lucis, *Porphyr. ἄλσος*.) & porticibus versabantur, ut admoniti augustioris habitaculi sanctitate, nihil aliud quam de virtutibus cogitarent. Sed & ipse *Plato* — ut posset vacare Philosophiæ, elegit Academicam villam ab urbe procul, non solum desertam sed & pestilentem; ut curâ & assiduitate morborum libidinis impetus frangeretur; discipulique sui nullam aliam sentirent voluptatem, nisi earum rerum quas discerent. *Hieron. adv. Jovin. L. 2.*

World,

World, were they to indulge themselves at large in all the innocent Pleasures and Entertainments of Life? Were they to be excell'd in Discipline and Self-denial by *Jews* and *Philosophers*? Were they, who were concern'd to remove *old* Prejudices, to raise *new* against themselves, by allowing themselves Liberties, which at least were disreputable, tho' not strictly immoral? Our Author perhaps who has no Regard for the Honour and Propagation of *Christianity*, might advise and wish the *Antient Christians* to act in such a manner. But those who are Friends to it must think, that in their voluntary Austerities they shew'd such Prudence, Virtue, and greatness of Mind, as deserve the highest Encomiums of Posterity.

III.

* *And Ecclesiastical History is full of Miracles done by such Madmen as Simeon Stylites.* I know our Author too well, to take his Judgment either of *Madness* or *Sence*. 'Tis more than probable, that it's downright *Madness* with him to believe any Miracles at all, of any Person or at any time. So that we are not to wonder, if *Symeon* and his Miracles have no sort of credit with Him. For this Reason I address myself here not to *him*, but to those who distinguish between Truth and Imposture, between clear and indisputable Evidence, and

that which is dark and suspicious. The great *Theodoret*, whose Character for Sense, Learning and Piety, is abundantly known and confess'd, was himself contemporary with *Symeon Stylites*, was personally and intimately acquainted with him, convers'd with Him for many years together, and declares himself an Eyewitness to the wonderful things related of Him. He has given us an account of a great Part of his Life, which he wrote while *Symeon* was yet alive, and appeals^a to all the World for the truth of what he says of Him. He farther tells us, that *Symeon* by his Miracles converted many thousands^o of *Pagans*, especially the *Isb-*

η Συμειώνη τὸν πάν, τὸ μέγα θαῦμα τῆς οἰκουμένης ἴσασι ἄρ ἔπαντις Ρωμῶν ἡγεμονίας ὑπῆκοι· ἔγνωσαν δὲ καὶ Πέρσαι, καὶ Μήδοι, καὶ Αἰθίοπις, καὶ ὡς Σκύθαι δὲ τὰς Νομάδας ἡ φήμη διαδραμῆσαι τὴν τῷδε φιλοπονίαν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἐδίδαξαν. Ἐγὼ δὲ, καὶ πάντας, ὡς ἔπος εἰπὲν, ἀνθρώπους ΜΑΡΤΥΡΑΣ ΕΧΩΝ τῶν ὑπὲρ λόγου ἀγῶνων, δίδωκα τὸ διήγημα, μὴ τοῖς ἱστομῆσι μῦθος εἶναι δοξῇ, πᾶσι τῆς ἀληθείας γυμνώμενος. Ἰψηλότερον γὰρ τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως τὰ γινόμενα. Φιλοῦσι δὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῇ φύσιν μιτρεῖν τὰ λεγόμενα· εἰ δὲ π τῶν ταύτης ὅρων ἐπίκεινται λέγειτο, ψευδὴς τῆς τῶν θεῶν ἀμυνήτοις ὁ λόγος νομίζεται. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῶν ἑυσεβῶντων γῆ καὶ θάλασσα πλήρης, τάτε θεῶν πεπαιδευμένων, καὶ τῷ παναγίου πνεύματος τὴν χάριν διδιδυγμένω, πῶς ληχνησμένοις ὅκ ἀπισήσουσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλα πισύτουσι, προθύμως καὶ θαρράλως ποιήσονται τὴν διήγησιν. *Histor. φιλοθ. c. 26. p. 876. 877.* Ἐγὼ δὲ ἡ μέρον τῶν θαυμάτων ΑΥΤΟΠΤΗΣ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τῶν γνησιωμένων ὡς ῥήσεως ἐγνόμην ἀκροατής, *Ibid. p. 885.*

ο Ὅτι ταῦτα τοῦτον ἔχῃ τὸν τρόπον, ἡ λόγοι μάρτυρες, ἀλλ' ἡ ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΩΝ ΒΟΗ. Τοὺς γὰρ Ἰσραηλῆτας, πολλὰς μυριάδας τῶ ζόφῳ τῆς ἀσθεθείας δαλνύουσας ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ κίονος ἐφάνησε γῆσις. Ὡς πρὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ πνοῇ λυχνίας τιθεὶς ὁ φανώματος ἄτος λόγος, ἡλίαν δίκην πάντοσε πῆς ἀκτῆς ἐξέπληψι. Καὶ ἔστιν ἰδῆν καὶ Ἰβήρας, ὡς ἔφην, καὶ Ἀρμενίους, καὶ Πέρσας ἀφικνουμένους, καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀ-

maelites

maelites to the *Christian* Religion, that he himself at *Symeon's* Desire gave many of them the Sacerdotal Benediction, and was in manifest danger of losing his Life by the violent impatience and Eagerness of the *Barbarians* to receive it from him. If we may not admit such Evidence as this in proof of a matter of Fact, I'm afraid we must shake the Evidence of all Human Testimony, and believe nothing but what we see, and feel, and know ourselves. Nay farther, our Author cannot prove, that there ever existed such a Man as *Symeon Stylites*, by better Evidence, than what I have produc'd to prove his Miracles.

I am sensible however, that some scruples and Difficulties may arise upon the Case,

πολύοντες. Ἰσχυροῦται δὲ κατὰ συμμορίας ἀφικνέμενοι, διακρίσιναι κατὰ ταυτὸν, καὶ τριακῆσιοι, ἔτι δ' ὅτι καὶ χίλιοι ἀρνοῦνται μὴ τὴν πατρῶαν ἐξαπάτην μετὰ βεβή, τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ ἐκείνων σεβασθέντα εἰδῶλα πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου ἐκείνου φωστῆρος συντρέχοντες, καὶ τοῖς τῆς Αφροδίτης ὀργίοις ἀποπαττόμενοι (ταύτης γὰρ ἀνέκαθεν τῆς δαίμονος κατεδίξαντο τὴν λάτρεϊαν) τῶν θείων ἀπολάουσι μυστηρίων. p. 883.—

ρ Καὶ τότε αὐτόπτης ἡγήμενη ἰγὰ, ἀκήρα, καὶ τῶν τὴν πατρῶαν ἀσέβειαν ἀρνομένων, καὶ τῇ ευαγγελικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ συνεπημέων. Καὶ κίνδυνος δὲ ἀπαξ ὑπέμεινα μίσγην. Αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὡς σελδῆν ἐκέλευσε, καὶ ΠΑΡ ΕΜΟΥ τὴν ἱερατικὴν ἐύλογίαν λαβεῖν.—βαρβαρικώτερον δὲ συνδραμόντες ἐκεῖνοι, οἱ μὲν ἔμπροσθεν εἶλπον, οἱ δὲ ὀπίσθεν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν πλαγίῳ οἱ δὲ ἀφισπῶντες τῶν ἄλλων ἰπποαῖνοντες, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ὡς τείνοντες, οἱ μὲν τὸ γένιον εἶλπον, οἱ δὲ τῶν ἰμωπῶν ἰππλάμδάνοντο. Καὶ ἀπικρίθη ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνων θιερμοτέρας ὡς σόδου, εἰ μὴ βοῇ χρησάμενος ἀπισκίδουσι ἀπάντας. Ibid. p. 883, 884. Vid. Evagr. H. E. I. 1. C. 13. Tillemont. Memoirs. Vom. 15. p. 347. Natalis Alexander. Hist. Eccl. Sxc. v. c. 4. Art. 25. Sam. Basnage. Annal. Tom. 3. p. 370, 516.

tho' *Theodore's* History of *Symeon* should stand uncontested. Such Miracles to some may seem a little strange and unaccountable, because they happen'd so late as the middle of the 5th Century, so long after the Civil Establishment of *Christianity* in the *Empire*, and some years after Miracles may perhaps be suppos'd unusual and unnecessary. Others may apprehend us in danger of *Popish* Legends, as if *they* might find Credit and Authority, if Stories of this kind should be admitted. I think it proper in this place to obviate Objections of this sort, both to confirm the *Antient* Miracles which are certainly true, and preclude the *Modern* pretended ones, which are certainly false. As to the former Objection, I allow there was a gradual decline of Miracles as to number and kind in the *Christian* Church, proportion'd to the State and Necessities of it. All the *Χαρίσματα* or *supernatural* Graces of the Spirit enumerated by St. Paul,* continued and flourished among the *Christians* in great abundance till the latter end of *Marcus Antoninus's* Reign⁹. The Church till then was as it were in it's Infancy, the Religion it taught was but lately erected, in Opposition to the Passions and Prejudices of a Sinful and Idolatrous World, and being upon these accounts hated and persecuted, and forc'd

* 1 Cor. c. 12. v. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. ⁹*Iren.* L. 11. c. 56, 57. L. v. c. 6. *Dodwell.* Diff. in *Iren.* II. §. 41.

to struggle with Bigotry, Vice, Power, and Malice, stood in great need of the plentiful Effusion of supernatural Gifts and Graces to support it's Friends, and convince it's Enemies^r. But after *Marcus's* Reign, when the Church had gain'd considerable Strength, when it's Numbers of all Ages, Conditions, and Sexes were grown very large in most parts of the Empire, and few *Expeditions* were undertaken for the Conversion of Idolatrous People, then we may observe a sensible decrease of miraculous Powers. The *φανέρωσις*^r or *manifestations* of the *Spirit* upon *Baptism*, the Gift of Tongues, and the power of discovering Men's inward thoughts, were now very rarely to be seen not only in Private *Christians*, but also in the *Bishops* and *Pastors*^t.

BUT tho' some Powers were withdrawn, yet others continued sufficient to astonish the *Pagan*, and encourage the *Christian*. Vision and Prophecy, and the power of casting out Devils, and healing all manner of Diseases, were frequent and eminent in the Church, for a 150 years after, as appears beyond all Dispute, from the *Acts* of *Perpetua* and *Felici-*

^r Vid *Dodwell*. in *Iren.* Diff. 2. §. 41, 42, 43.

^f Spiritus ita Baptizatis ut plurimum collatus est, ut externo aliquo & sensibili signo sese manifestârit, quam illi Spiritus *φανέρωσις* appellabant. — Has *φανέρωσις* signa alibi appellat *Apostolus*. *Dodwell*. ib. §. 8.

^t *Dodwell*. ib. §. 44.

tas^u, *Tertullian*^w, *Theophilus* of *Antioch*^x, *Origen*^y, *Minutius Felix*^z, *Cyprian*^a, *Arnobius*^b, *Lactantius*^c, and *Julius Firmicus*^d. These Writers carry down the Evidence of Miracles as low as the beginning of the fourth Century. In this Age the *Christian* Religion was embrac'd and establish'd by the Civil Power; so that now Persecutions were at an End, and the Church was to enjoy after so many Storms a glorious Calm in Peace and Plenty. This Revolution of things, as it certainly *abated* the necessity of Miracles, so in fact it occasion'd a visible decrease of them. Yet instances there were in these flourishing times of miraculous Powers in the Church, as publick, as clear, and as well attested as any in the Ages preceding. Thus *James* Bishop of *Nisibis* deliver'd his City from the *Persians*, by infesting the whole Army with Flies, by which the *Horses*, and *Elephants*, and other Beasts of burden among them were so stung and distracted, that *Sapor* the *Persian* King was forc'd to raise the Siege in great Disorder and

u Ap. *Ruinart*. Act. Mart. Ed. 2. p. 92. w Ad *Scap.*
 c 2. 4. Apolog. c. 23. 27. 37. 43. 46. De Spectac. c. 26 De
 Anim. c. 57. De Idolol. c. 11. x Ad Autol. I. 2. 77, 78. Ox.
 y Cont. Cels. L. 1. p. 7, 21, 34, 35. L. 2. p. 62, 80. L. 3. p.
 124. L. 7. p. 334, 376. z Octav. p. 279. Ed. *Gronov.*
 a Lib. ad Donat. p. 3, 4. Ed. *Oxon.* Epist. ad Magn. 69.
 Idol. Van. p. 14. Ad Demetrian. p. 101. b Adv. Gent.
 L. 1. p. 14, 27. c Instit. Divin. L. 2. c. 15. L. 3.
 c. 26. Mort. Persecut. n. 10, 11. g Error Prof.
 Relig. p. 433. Ed. *Gronov.*

Disgrace*. The same *James* had the gift of Prophecy, of raising the Dead to Life, and of working other Miracles, by which he became very eminent in the *East*, ταῖς ἀπάντων περιφερόμενος γλώσσαις says *Theodore*^f, and an happy instrument of spreading and confirming *Christianity* in *Persia* and the Countries adjacent. After him, about the year 373, *Macarius* the Elder was greatly distinguish'd in *Ægypt* by his gift of Prophecy, his power of healing Diseases, and casting out Devils; all which powers were attended with publick and permanent Effects, and are fully and strongly attested by *Socrates*^g, *Sozomen*^h, *Theodore*ⁱ, and *Palladius*^k. A few years after *Martinus* Bishop of *Tours* in *France* was celebrated as loudly in the *West* for miraculous Operations, perform'd in such a manner, and related by such Authorities, and so far remov'd from *Fraud* and *Fiction*, by *Nature* and *Event*, that, I think, it is not reasonable to doubt of them^l. Add to these Instances of Miracles in private Persons, some *publick* indications by Miracle of the Favour of God towards *Christianity*, and his

e See *Theodore*. Hist. Eccl. L. 2. c. 30. Id. Hist. φιλοθ. c. 1. Hieron. Chron. A. 338. *Cave*. Hist. Liter. Vol. 1. p. 141. *Sam. Basnag*. Annal. Tom. 2. p. 865, 866.

f Hist. φιλοθ. p. 767.

g H. E. L. 4. c. 23.

h H. E. L. 3. c. 14.

i H. E. L. 4. c. 21.

k Hist. Lauf. c. 19. See *Cave*. Hist. Litt. Vol. 1. p. 207.

l See *Sulpit. Vit. Martini*. Cap. v. vii. viii. xii. xiii. xvi. xvii. Dialog. ii. cap. ii. iv.

great Displeasure against it's Enemies. Such was the wonderful Defeat of *Julian's* Attempt to rebuild the Temple, by an Earthquake and dreadful Eruptions of Fire bursting out near the Foundation, which burnt down what had been erected, and destroyed those that were employ'd in it. And all this we have related not only by *Christian* Writers, but also by an *Heathen* Historian *Ammianus Marcellinus*^m, who was then living, and serv'd in the Army himself under *Julian*. Such also was the Victoryⁿ of *Theodosius* the Great over *Eugenius* the Tyrant and *Pagan*, in the year 394; the circumstances of which were so very memorable and extraordinary, that *Claudian*^o the *Heathen* Poet could not but give his Testimony to it.

Thus far we have trac'd the Miracles of the fourth century, not enumerating every single Instance that happen'd during that Period, but only selecting some few of the Principal ones, which are proof sufficient in the present Case.

^m Hist. L. 23. c. 1. ⁿ *Socrat.* Hist. Ecc. L. v. c. 25. *Sozom.* L. 7. c. 24. *Augustin.* Civ. D. L. v. c. 26. *Theodoret.* L. v. c. 24. *Rufinus.* Hist. L. 11. c. 23. *Orosius.* L. 7. c. 35.

^o Te propter gelidis Aquilo de monte procellis
Obruit adversas acies, revolutaque tela
Vertit in auctores, & turbine reppulit hastas.
O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris
Æolus armatas hiemes, cui militat æther,
Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti.

In tert. Conf. Honor.

But

But neither were Miracles confin'd to this Age of *Christianity*; the *Fifth* also had it's Portion of true ones, tho' smaller by several Degrees than that of the preceding. When *Atticus* was Bishop of *Constantinople*, a *Jew* who had continued a *Paralytic* for many years, and could find no relief from all the advice of the best Physicians, was resolv'd at last to embrace the *Christian* Religion; and being hereupon introduc'd to *Atticus*, and first instructed by Him in the Principles of *Christianity*, was carried in his Bed to the *Baptistery* or *Font*, where after receiving *Baptism* in the usual Form, he was freed immediately from his Disease, and from that time enjoy'd perfect health. This Story is related by *Socrates*^q, who liv'd at the very place^r where, and the time when^s this fact happen'd. He concludes his account with telling us^t, that many *Greeks* upon seeing this Miracle, believ'd in *Jesus Christ* and were *Baptized*. About the same time *St. Austin*^u

p Ουτε δὲ θαυμάσιον ἢ ἰαμάτων ἢ τῶν χρόνων τούτων κατάστασις ἄμειρος ἦν. *Socrat. H. E. L. 7. c. 4.*

q *H. E. L. 7. c. 4.*

r *Vid. H. E. L. v. c. 24.*

s Τάυτην τὴν Θεραπείαν ἢ τῷ Χριστῷ δυνάμει ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΗΜΕΤΕΡΟΙΣ ΚΑΙΡΟΙΣ διέταξεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἰθὺς. *Ibid. L. 7. c. 4.*

t Δι' ἧν (Θεραπείαν) Ἕλληνες μὴ πολλοὶ πιστεύοντες ἐκκατήθησαν. *Ibid.*

u *Fiunt etiam nunc multa miracula; eodem Deo faciente per quos vult, qui & illa, quæ legimus, (in Evangeliiis) fecit. — Nec tamen omnia colligi poterunt; sed tantum de quibus libelli dati sunt, qui recitarentur in populo. Id namque fieri volumus, cum videremus antiquis similia divinarum signa virtutum etiam nostris temporibus frequentari. Civ. Dei. L. 22. c. 8.*

informs us, that Miracles were so extraordinary and frequent in *Africa*, that large accounts were written and publish'd of them, and read to the People in the Churches. He himself has given us a Catalogue of several, to which he was himself an Eyewitness. And the rest were so strongly attested both by the Effects and relators of them, that to doubt their reality, were to doubt the Evidence of Sense. St. *Austin* had scarce finish'd his excellent Books *de Civitate Dei*, before *Symeon Stylites*, who is the Subject of the present Remark, became celebrated in the *East*; and in less than ten years after *Theodoret* publish'd that Account of his Miracles, to which I have refer'd for the truth of them. So that Miracles were evidently continued in the Church till *Symeon's* time, and consequently those of *Symeon* are liable to no just Suspicion on account of their late Appearance. Nay it's farther remarkeable, that near twenty years after *Symeon* was dead, *Huneric* the *Arian Vandal* began his Persecution against the Orthodox party in *Africa*, and among other instances of Cruelty, he order'd the Tongues of several eminent Persons to be cut out. On which occasion God was pleas'd to rebuke the *Arian* faction, by working a Miracle in favour of their adversaries. He gave to the Orthodox Confessors an articulate Voice, when the Organ was lost by a barbarous Violence. This
 piece

piece of History has lately stood the test of a severe Examination; and is so well supported by Authorities, and so ably defended by a Learned and accurate Writer^w, that I need not enlarge in any Vindication of it.

Now to what has been said, I must subjoin the following observations.

1st. THAT these Miracles which I have produc'd, were of a publick Nature, perform'd in the sight of great numbers of People, of different and opposite Opinions, Inclinations and Interests. Here therefore there could be no room for Delusion and Imposture.

2. THESE Miracles were attended with beneficial and permanent Effects, such for instance as the Conversion of *Pagans*, and the Cure of Diseases immediately by a word or by prayer, without any sort of Medicinal application. These could never possibly have gain'd any Credit in the World, unless Experience and the strongest Evidence of Sense had prov'd them to be true. For what Person alive, let him be as superstitious and credulous as possible, would ever believe that either himself or any other Person was actually cur'd of the *Gout* or *Palsie*, if he felt or saw, that the Disease still continued where it was before?

w Dr. Berriman, Sermon. vi. p. 327. Defence Part. 2.

3. THE end and use of these Miracles was not to confirm any idle Errors and Superstitions, nor to serve any Political Schemes of Avarice or Ambition, but purely to advance the Glory and Interest of Truth and Virtue, and extinguish that abominable Idolatry, which had fatally spread itself over all Nations.

4. WE take our Accounts of these Miracles from Writers of unquestionable Integrity, Piety, and Learning, Men who themselves were Eyewitnesses to many of the Facts, and who often declare in the most serious and solemn manner^x, that what they relate, they know and can assure us to be true.

5. THESE Miracles were far from being vain and unnecessary in such a Sense, as to render them doubtful and suspicious to after-Ages. It is true, they were not absolutely necessary at this time, either to vindicate the Justice of God, or to support the *Christian* Religion. God Almighty had already vouchsaf'd to the

^x Obsecro autem eos, qui lecturi sunt, ut fidem dictis attribuant; neque me quidquam nisi *compertum* & *probatum* scripsisse arbitrentur; alioquin tacere quam falsa dicere maluissem. *Sulp. Sev. Vit. Mart. c. 1.* Ego mihi conscius sum, me rerum fide & amore Christi impulsus, ut hæc scriberem, *manifesta* exposuisse, *vera* dixisse. *Id. ib. c. 27.*

Τῶν ληχθησμένων ἐν αὐτῇ πόλει καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐκείνης ἐπαρχίαις ἐκείνων ἐκείνων, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων ἐκείνων καὶ διδασκαλίας ἐκείνων. *Theodoret. Præf. Hist. Phil.*

Pagan sufficient means of conviction, so that no more signs and wonders could now be *demanded* with any Reason and Modesty by the Infidel. God had also rais'd up a Succession of *Emperours*, to protect and maintain his Church, so that now it no longer wanted the supernatural Assistance of Miracles. But what then? Were Miracles therefore become entirely useless and superfluous? Or because the Almighty was not oblig'd in *Justice* to work any more, was his *Goodness* and *Mercy* restrain'd from it by Consequence? Certainly not. As the use of Miracles in the three first Centuries was to convert the *Pagan* to *Christianity*, so those of the fourth and fifth were useful to the same great End. We find that thousands of *Heathens* were by these perswaded to relinquish their old Superstitions, and believe in *Jesus Christ*. Was this no Reason and Occasion for them? And again. As God in all his Dispensations is wont to do more abundantly for us, than either we can ask or think, so I cannot understand, why he might not extend his Mercies and Bounties to some Generations of *Pagans* after *Constantine's* time, as well as to those before him. This I am perfectly assur'd of, that matters of *Fact*, such as these Miracles are, attested by the strongest moral Evidence, by an Evidence equal to that by which most of the antient Miracles are supported, can never be overthrown by any slight
and

and Superficial Reasonings of this sort. If indeed an Infidel should complain of the Cessation of Miracles at this Day, it would be proper to tell him, that his Complaints are very unreasonable, because Miracles now cannot be necessary. But if it should happen at this Day, that a *Turk* or a *Jew* were rais'd publickly and instantly from the Dead by the name of *Jesus*, and numbers of either sort of People upon seeing the Miracle were immediately to renounce their former Religion, and embrace *Christianity*, I believe, it would be reckon'd extreme perverseness and obstinacy to deny the Fact, tho' attested by the Senses of a thousand honest and understanding witnesses, upon no other grounds, but merely because there was no absolute Necessity for it.

LASTLY, As to the fabulous Pretences of the *Papists*, or of any others, they are absolutely incapable of receiving any countenance and authority from hence. y Bp. *Stillingfleet* and Mr. *Dodwell* have shewn^z, that the Nature, Evidence, and effects of the antient Miracles have no similitude and affinity with those modern impostures. Let a *Protestant* of common capacities compare the circumstances of the one with the other, and he'll easily discern as much difference between them, as there is be-

y Vindicat. Protest. Grounds of Faith. C 3. p. 170.—262.
Fol. Vol. V.

z Diff. in *Iren.* II. §. 63, 64, 65, 66.

tween

tween Gold and Brass, between Light and Dark-
ness. And 'tis just as unreasonable, to reject
those Miracles which are true, because others
are false, as it is to deny the Authority of
any Books that are genuine, because many
have been prov'd to be spurious.

IV.

* *And 'twas owing to these Superstitious Notions,*
that such numbers of Monasteries and Nunneries
were soon founded, to the great Oppression and De-
population of the Christian World. No one will
deny upon Protestant Principles, that *Monasteries*
and *Nunneries* did once oppress and depopulate
the Christian World; but this was not owing
to *these Superstitious Notions*, that is, to the Ri-
gour and Severities of the *Antient Christians*,
and to the Credit of *real Miracles*, perform'd
in the Ages of *Light and Virtue*, for the Be-
nefit and Conversion of *Idolatrous Pagans*, but
wholly to the Ignorance, Avarice, Iniquity, and
Superstition of latter Ages. *Monasteries* were
antiently Schools of *Learning and Religion*, and
(it seems) upon this account were esteem'd
the properest Nurseries for the *Christian Youth*.
The greatest Men of the Church were educa-
ted and instructed in them, being sent by their
Parents thither as to the safest places of good
Education; not with a design to oblige them

* Ibid.

always to continue in the Monastick Life, but only to train them up, and settle them securely in the ways of Virtue. They were so far then from *oppressing* the Christian World, that they greatly assisted and adorn'd it. Perhaps it may sound incredible, but certain it is, that *Monasteries* once had neither any standing Revenues, nor any Regard to Estates and Possessions. These they were oblig'd by Principle and Profession to renounce and despise; the *Monks* maintain'd themselves usually by their own Labour; and such was their Industry and Charity, that they often reliev'd the Necessities of others in great abundance. Even when they had some Possessions, either by Endowment or natural Inheritance, they chiefly distributed them in charitable Uses, reserving very little to themselves, and abhorring the thoughts of Luxury and Idleness. They were also Honest, Humble, and Religious, not encroaching on the Duties, Rights, and Privileges of other Men, but setting the purest Examples of Virtue and Integrity. This is not a false and Extravagant Character of the *Antient* Monasteries; it is shewn at large by the Learned and accurate *Bingham*^a to be just and exact. There you may likewise see, how widely the *Antient* Monasteries differ'd from the *Modern* in Nature, Constitution, and Practice, how remote they were from the Cor-

^a Antiquities. Book. vii. Chapt. 1. ii. iii.

ruptions of *Popery*, and how much they may deserve the Approbation of the strictest *Protestants*. Who would ever exclaim and inveigh against *Monasteries*, if they never contain'd worse Men than *Montfaulcon* or *Mabillon*? Who would blame or ridicule a single, recluse, and austere Life, if the Products and Employments of it, were as good as the Studies and Labours of those Men? Their Industry and Erudition is an Ornament to their Country, as well as to their Order, and their daily indefatigable searches for the Advancement of Literature have acquir'd them the Applause of all *Europe*. As frightful and odious as the name of *Monk* is, I question whether one *Montfaulcon* with his Cell and Severities about him, were he a Native and Inhabitant of *Great Britain*, would not generally be esteem'd a greater Honour, and more valuable to it, than all the *Free:thinkers* this Day in the Kingdom.

As to *Nunneries*^b, they also in the *Modern* Sense of the Word were not known to Antiquity, but were founded on different Principles, conducted with more Decorum and Purity, and gain'd Veneration to the *Christian* Religion from the *Gentile* World. If the Reader would see more of this Institution, the same Learned Man^c will inform him of many curious particulars.

^b Our *English* Name, Nun, comes from an old *Egyptian* Word mention'd first by *Jerom*, *Nonna*, which signifies, Chast or Holy, and *Nonnus* was applied to Men in the same Sense.

^c *Antiq.* Book. vii. Chapt. iv.

V.

* *The Great St. Jerom says, that it was undoubtedly a part of Faith, to go, and worship in those places, where the Feet of our Saviour had once stood. This is introduc'd to insinuate, that the Holy Wars, and the Pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and the wonderful Merits and Virtues ascrib'd to them by ignorant Bigots, had their Rise from the Great St. Jerom and the Saints of his time. If this (Holy Wars &c.) was superstition, says he, it was built on a Notion which had long before prevail'd, of believing it a piece of Piety to visit Jerusalem, and the Holy places there. If St. Jerom had too much Piety, his Censurer has too little Equity, otherwise he would never have disguis'd and misrepresented St. Jerom so shamefully. St. Jerom, whom our Author stiles great with a Sneer and Irony, understood the nature of Piety and Superstition as well as any Man living, and had too much discretion to believe, that a Visit to Jerusalem and the Holy Places there had in itself any real Piety or Virtue. Let him only speak for himself. In his excellent Epistle to Paulinus, he desires him not to think, that his Faith was therefore imperfect, because he had never seen Jerusalem, or that himself and his Company were the better, meerly because they*

had fix'd their habitation in that place^d. That it was not the living in Jerusalem barely that was laudable, but the living well there^e. That every believer was valued not according to the differences of Places, but the Merit of his Faith^f. That Heaven was equally open either from Britain or Jerusalem^g. This, I hope, may clear him from that silly superstition, which our Author would fix upon him.

WELL, but what then is the meaning of St. Jerom's *pars Fidei* in the other passage? Why does he there expressly affirm it to be a *Piece of piety* to visit *Jerusalem*? The Case was this. St. Jerom was very desirous of enjoying his Friend *Desiderius's* Company at *Jerusalem*. Therefore he writes him an affectionate Epistle, pressing him with great earnestness and entreaties to take a journey thither^h. Among other Arguments to persuade his Friend he

^d Cur, inquires, hæc tam longo repetita principio? videlicet ne quidquam fidei tua deesse putes, quia *Jerusalem* non vidisti; nec nos idcirco meliores æstimes, quod hujus Loci habitaculo fruimur. Ep. 49. Ed. Bened. Tom 4. P. 2.

^e Non *Jerusalem* fuisse, sed *Jerusalem* bene vixisse laudandum est. *Ibid.*

^f Singuli quique credentium, non locorum diversitatibus, sed fidei merito ponderantur. *Ibid.*

^g De *Jerusalem* & de *Britannia* æqualiter patet aula cœlestis. *Ibid.*

^h Quod venerabilis *Paula* me est deprecata ut facerem; sponte facio; hortorque vos & precor per Domini charitatem, ut nobis vestros tribuatis aspectus; & per occasionem sanctorum locorum, tanto nos ditetis munere. Ep. 48. ad *Desider.*

uses this at last, that, if he had no inclination for the company of him and of those that were with him, yet *at least his Religion should prompt him to worship, where the Feet of the Lord stood.* Such a curiosity is a natural Effect, (or Indication, or Expression) of a zealous and sincere Faithⁱ. This is the full drift and purport of the sentence in St. Jerom; which is just as superstitious and offensive^k, as to say, that to visit Italy, Greece, and Ægypt, which were once

i Certè, si consortia nostra displicuerint, adorasse ubi steterunt pedes Domini, pars fidei est. Ep. ad Desider. p. 48. T. 4. P. 2. Ed. Ben.

k Meo quidem animo, nihil magis accendit pietatem, & desiderium nostrum inflammat erga Deum, quam in rem presentem veluti descendere, per orationem ad Deum fusam, meditationem de Deo seriam iis in locis, ubi ille olim magnalia sua declaravit. Certè, si in monte Olivarum constitutus juxta Bethaniam historiam Christi Jesu ascendentis in cœlos ex Actibus Apostolicis legerem, vel recolerem; videre mihi viderer Dominum *ἐν τῇ ἀσένοντι τῇς Ἀποστόλων*, nube candidâ derepentè circumfusum, per aërem in cœlos lento passu gradientem, & cetera illa, quæ in rem presentem testes Apostoli adhibiti intuebantur. — Et istum usum qui negant resultare de visitationibus locorum sanctorum, de peregrinationibus ad loca illa Jesu Christi *διὰ τῶν ὁδῶν* vestigiis calcata, ego illos sapere & valere ultra homines crediderim, quibus non est opus ad pietatis studium vel exercitium humano aliquo infirmitatis naturalis adjumento, Montacut. Orig. Eccles. P. 1. p. 44. Si non est illiberalis curiositas illorum, qui Pyramides, qui obesa senio faxa, qui Amphitheatri rudera, qui Græcos vel Romanos Antiquitates pervertigant, quis sanus vituperaverit hominem, qui sedulo oculis legerit loca, ubi Deus Israelitis mare divisit, aut ubi Lex promulgata est, aut Templum extructum, aut Christus Crucifixus? Imo nec eum reprehendimus, quem aspectus talium locorum ad Deum ibi adorandum commoverit; aut qui oculis suis usus sit ad incrementum pietatis, tactus non lapidum, sed Dei Reverentiâ, Malinæus. Ibid.

the flourishing seats of Learning, and to trace and survey the scatter'd remains and Monuments of Antiquity, *pars est Eruditionis, Is a part of Learning.* I wonder, so acute a Man as *Daille*, should think it any difficulty to reconcile these different Passages of *Jerom*. Is it any strange thing to see the word *Pars* us'd by *Latin* Writers in a loose and extensive Sense? What *part* shall we call that in *Virgil*,

*Pars mihi pacis erit dextram tetigisse tyranni**.

Was it a *constituent part* of an *integral whole*, as the Logicians speak? Or was it only a *circumstantial part*, of so little consequence, that the *Peace* was neither concluded by it, nor imperfect without it? Again. What sort of *part* is that to be esteem'd, which *Celsus* the old Physician speaks of in this Sentence, *Parsque Sanitatis est vomitum esse suppressum†*? Surely no very great and considerable one. There are several other Senses of *Pars* in Antiquity, such as *munus, officium, modus, &c.* which are common and obvious. Where now is the great *Superstition* or inconsistency of *Jerom*, if all that he says is *pars fidei*, and that may be a safe and innocent Expression?

THERE is one thing more to be observ'd here, that our Author very honestly and in-

* *Aeneid*. VII. v. 266.

† *Lib.* 4. c. 11.

genuously

genuously quotes St. *Ferom* in this manner; *Certè adorâsse ubi steterunt Pedes Domini, Pars Fidei est.* Then to give an Emphasis to *Pars Fidei*, he translates the word *Certè*, undoubtedly. But St. *Ferom*'s Original is different. *Certè, si consortia nostra displicuerint, adorâsse &c.* Where it is evident, that *certè* signifies, not undoubtedly, but however, or at least; and does not add any force to *Pars Fidei*, but expresses only a transition from one Argument to another.

S E C T. IV.

O F C R E D U L I T Y.

We find the Christians in the Primitive times came intirely into a gross imposture, and had Faith for the most palpable Forgery of the Sybilline Oracles being writ by real Prophetesses under divine Inspirations. (p. 116.)

WHAT trifling Shuffles and Ambiguities have we here! *Sybilline Oracles* and *palpable Forgeries*, without one word of distinction what *Oracles* and *Forgeries* he means. If he means the present collection of *Sybilline Verses* publish'd by *Opsopæus* and afterwards by *Gallæus*, 'tis indeed a *palpable Forgery*, and every body owns it. But this is nothing to the *Primitive Christians*, who were so far from believing it *inspir'd* and genuine, that they never had seen it; the
Col.

Collection itself not appearing in the present Form, till probably Hundreds of Years after their Decease^a. But if he means the *Sibylline Oracles*, which the Ancients quoted against the Pagans, the *Forgery* is not the *most palpable*, nor *most probable*; and whatever he may think, it requires much greater Abilities than our Author's to prove it indisputably.

We may presume, I suppose, that Bishop *Beveridge* and Dr. *Jenkin* were at least as good Judges of *Forgeries* as this Gentleman; and yet after all the critical Disputes that had pass'd upon the *Sibylline Oracles*, they saw no Reason to condemn the *ancient Christians* of such Blindness and Credulity. They^b offer'd many strong and judicious Arguments in their Favour, which at least might prevail with a candid Man to be cautious and tender in his Censures. Dr.

^a Non immerito suspicantur Viri Docti, Sanctos Patres non habuisse illos Libros Oraculorum Sibyllinorum, qui nunc sub Sibyllarum nomine circumferuntur. *Gallæus. de Sibyll. c. 15. p. 313.*

^b Nos sane hodiernæ Sibyllinorum, ut vocantur, Oraculorum rapsodiæ causam non defendimus, sed istorum tantum earminum, quibus antiquissimi Religionis nostræ assertores testimonium suum reddiderunt, de quibus æquum ex iis quæ nunc extant judicium ferri non potest. Quamplurima enim antiquitus laudata, ut omnibus notum est, in hodierna collectione desiderantur. Alia quamplurima quindecim sæculorum spatio *de novo* haud dubiè addita & interpolata sunt. Persuasum habemus, ea quæ à *S. Justino* aliisque ejusdem sæculi scriptoribus citata sunt, multis ante annis sub Sibyllæ nomine Romanis cognita fuisse, iisque pro *genuinis* ejusdem oraculis vulgò habita. *Beveridg. Cod. Can. L. 1. c. 14. §. 11. p. 146.*

Jenkin says ^c, *It were no difficult Matter to answer all the Objections, which are wont to be brought against the Sibylline Oracles so far as the Notion here proposed is concern'd in them. For tho' the Books which we have now, contain manifest Falsifications and Forgeries, yet there must have been something real.—The Fathers were neither impudent nor stupid Men, and that which could proceed from nothing but a Mixture of Impudence and Stupidity can with no Reason or Justice be charged upon them.*

NEITHER is it evident, that the *Christians* in the primitive Times believed the *Sibyls* to be real *Prophetesses* under divine Inspirations ^d. If they did, how came it to pass that they never admitted them into the Canon of Scripture? *Justin Martyr* indeed speaks of *τινὸς δυνάμεως ἐμπνοίας*, some strong Inspiration, but how does it appear that he thought it a divine one? Why might he not esteem it a Possession of the Devil, which in some particular Instances might be so controul'd and directed by the Providence of God, as to utter many Truths and Instructions for the Good of the Pagan

^c Reasonab. Christ. Vol. I. p. 113, 111.

^d *Constat Patres Græcos non credidisse Sibyllas fuisse divinitus inspiratas.—Uti autem Græci Patres talia docuerunt, ex quibus constat Sibyllas non posse judicari divinitus fuisse afflatas, sic etiam reperimus censuisse Patres Latinos. Gallens ub. sub. c. 22. p. 522.*

World? A *Balaam*^e and a *Caiaphas*, we know, had such sudden and temporary inspirations, and why might not the *Sibyl* have the same *occasionally*, tho' *ordinarily* a wretched *Dæmoniack*? As to the word *Propheteesses*, I question whether it ever occurs in the *Primitive Writers*, and much more whether it is ever once applied to the *Sibyls*. So that our Author must produce besides confident assertions some few substantial Authorities and Arguments, before the *Forgeries* he talks of are palpable, and the *Christians* ridiculous for believing them.

I have now Examined all the material Reflections and Charges, which my Author has scatter'd up and down to ridicule the *Primitive Christians*. I am not aware, that I have misrepresented either *Him* or *Antiquity* in any one Instance; if I have, it is without Design, and my own Inclination. I'm as little sensible, that I have treated my Adversary with any unbecoming Severity and Vehemence in Expression. *Railing* and *contumely* I hate and contemn; but 'tis neither of these (if the

^e As Balaam an Inchanter or Sorcerer deliver'd a true and famous Prophecy of Christ, and the Devils were forc'd to confess him to be the Son of God; so it is reasonable to believe, that God might ordain that these celebrated Propheteesses, whose Oracles were otherwise the Devil's Instruments to promote his Ends, should foretell our Saviour's Coming. Jenkin's Reasonab. Vol. 1. p. 122.

words have any fix'd signification in *Morality*) to represent *Men* and *Things* as they *really* and *manifestly* are, that is, to expose before the World in a just and proper Light any flagrant *Impieties*, *Blunders*, *Falshoods*, and *Impostures*. Crimes of this Magnitude whenever they are discover'd in those, who pretend Magisterially to censure *old* Systems of Religion, and set up *new* ones in their Room, should, I think, be made as detestable and ridiculous as they *deserve*. It is the *Duty* of *many*, and common *Justice* to *all*, to strip a *Wolf* of his *Sheeps cloathing*, lest he tear and devour the Flock; and I question whether any one would be greatly offended with that Physician, who should lay before his Eyes the latent Poyson of a Draught, which an Enemy in Disguise had offer'd him.

—*Hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto,*

P O S T.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE I publish'd my former *Remarks*, I have met with some Passages in a Learned *Foreigner*, which, as they concern in some measure what I have advanc'd under one Article, require particular Notice and Consideration. The Person I mean is *Mosheim*, who has eminently distinguish'd himself by his Answer to *Toland* and other Writings, and deserv'd the Esteem of all good and Learned Men. But I must however observe, that this excellent Man is too apt sometimes *δολέειν τῇ ὑποθέσει*, and to run into Extremes, which a cool and considerate Judgment cannot but disapprove. My Business at present shall be to clear and confirm, what I have said before, by examining some assertions of *Mosheim* that lie against me.

IN my former *Remarks*, I endeavour'd to explain and vindicate St. *Jerom* from the Charge of not *speaking the Truth*, and thinking that every thing was lawful, which serv'd to gain the Victory. I there laid before the Reader, what appear'd to me to be the genuine Sense of *Jerom*, such as sufficiently secur'd his *Veracity* and *Honesty*. *Mosheim*, I find, gives the worst inter-

interpretation to *Jerom's* words, and draws a Character of Him, which is very severe and offensive.

BEFORE I proceed any further, it may be proper to look back to a Passage in *Mosheim*, which seems to have given occasion to that rigorous Censure of *Jerom*, which follows afterwards. *Jerom* had said of *Cerintus* and *Ebion* in an Epistle^a to *Augustine*, *propter hoc solum à Patribus anathematizati sunt, quod Legis Ceremonias Christi Evangelio miscuerunt*. This seem'd at first sight to clash with the accounts, which other Ecclesiastical Writers had given of *Corinthus* and *Ebion*, who are charg'd by them with other erroneous Doctrines besides the observance of *Legal Ceremonies*. Whereupon *Mosheim*, who was labouring to prove the innocence of the *Nazaréans* in comparison of the *Ebionites*, is highly displeas'd with *Jerom* for making no difference between them, and accuses him of *Fraud* and *Prevarication*^b purely

^a Epistol. 74: Ed. Ben.

^b Quod de *Ebionais* & *Cerinthianis* dicit, nullam aliam ob causam eos condemnatos esse, quam quod Christum sic admitterent, ut *Mosen* non repudiarent, planè falsum est. Si qua Fides enim vetustissimis est scriptoribus, longè graviora erant, quorum postulabantur crimina, levissimum hoc, quod *Hieronymus* arripit—Conjicio fanè, quid ut his se commacularet erroribus, virum optimum induxerit. Barata est excusatio.—Disputabat *Hieronymus*, rixabatur, *Augustinum* impugnabat.—Hoc loco *Augustino* ipsi constitutam erat ostendere, quam nefarius esset error, quem *Hippocensium* Antistes non tam immanem

to serve his turn against St. *Augustine*. But all this was a false Alarm against *Jerom*, and proceeded from nothing else but a misinterpretation of the word *solum*. For *Jerom* did not use it, as *Mosheim* understood him, in an *Exclusive* but only a *distinctive* Sense; that is, he did not mean to assert, that the *Ebionite* and *Cerinthian* were condemn'd by the *Fathers* for *no other* crime, but only that they were condemn'd for this *alone*, consider'd by itself and *separate from the rest*. This was true enough, and was sufficient to make his Argument good against St. *Augustine*, if St. *Augustine* had argu'd upon contrary Principles. Bp. *Bull* in his excellent Book *Judicium Ecclesie Catholicae* &c. explain'd this Sentence of *Jerom* after the same manner^c, and indeed *Jerom* himself directs us to such a Construction. For he says immediately afterwards, *Quid dicam de Ebionitis, qui Christianos esse se simulant? Why should I say any*

crediderat, abrogatos semel ritus, quos Moses sanxerat, denuo sibi imponere. *Disimulat* igitur, *fingit*, *rapit*, trahit quodcumque potest, ut majorem demonstrationi vim ac speciem conciliet. Si rationes claudicant, more quorundam Hominum ea substituit, de quorum veritate ipsemet non persuasus erat. *Cont. Toland. Vindic. Sect. 1. c. 6. p. 165, 169.*

c Minimè voluit *Hieronymus* Cerinthum & Ebionem *nullam aliam Hæresin* fovisse, ob quam à Patribus anathematizati fuerint; (quippe nescire non poterat *Ebionem* ab antiquis Hæresis condemnatum fuisse, quod Christi Divinitatem negaret; *Cerinthum* verò tum ob eandem Hæresin, tum ob alia impia dogmata, ex albo Christianorum erasum fuisse) sed ob eum *solum* errorem, si *cetera* orthodoxi fuissent, dignos fuisse à Patribus judicatos, qui anathemate percuterentur. Cap. 2. §. 13.

thing

thing of the Ebionites, who are only pretenders to Christianity, being guilty of other Crimes and false Doctrines? A plain indication that he knew, they were otherwise erroneous and obnoxious! This was also observ'd by Bp. Bull^d, and illustrated in a copious Paraphrase upon *Jerom's* words.

FROM hence it appears very possible, that *Mosheim* may be too censorious and precipitate in what he says afterwards of *Jerom*, where to confirm the Reflection, which he had pass'd upon him with some Warmth before, he tells us, that *Frauds, Fallacies, and Lies* he expressly allows, whenever a Cause or Interest may be serv'd by them. That he plainly distinguishes between the way of Writing, which is us'd in a *Dispute*, and that which is made use of in plain *Discourses*. In the former *Circumvention* and *Fraud* might have a place, in the latter *ingenuity* and *openness* were necessary^e. Nay

d Quia verò illud ab Adversario in dubium vocari potuisse videret, ideò ab exemplo *Cerinthi & Ebionis* ultrò ipse recedit, alio argumento à *Nazarais* sumpto, quod omnem cavillandi anfam præscinderet, pugnaturus: *Quid dicam*, inquit, *de Ebionais, qui Christianos esse se simulant?* Quasi diceret, de *Ebionais* fortasse causaberis, neque ego diffiteor, ipsos de Christo Domino impiè sentire, utpote Hominem tantummodò illum esse docentes; proinde utut *Christianos se simulent*, pro verè *Christianis* tamen minimè habendos; At verò &c. *Ibid.*

e Adfirmabat *Hieronymus* — licere omninò *mentiri*, si id res nostræ ita ferant. — Ipsemet se interdum *mentiri* solere, nec quæ sentiat, in controversiis præsertim expromere non diffitetur. — Disertè inter illud scribendi genus, quod *erudiat & instruat*, &
farther

farther, that to countenance this Doctrine of his, he attributes the same kind of *Fraud* and *Sophistry* to *St. Paul* and all the *Antients* before him^f.

A severe and grievous Accusation! Such as in Justice and Charity ought to be supported by strong and indisputable Evidence, by nothing less than either express, or at least equivalent words. Now the Ground of this Charge is laid by *Mosheim* himself in *St. Jerom's Apology* for his Book against *Jovinian*. Let us see therefore what the *Father* confesses of himself. Has he any such word as *mendacium* or *menti-ri* in the controverted Passages? No. Does he mention *Fallacies*, *Frauds*, and *Circumventions*? Not a Syllable. How then does he own himself guilty of all these Crimes? Why truly he has the boldness and hardness to declare, *that 'tis one thing to write in a Polemical way, and another in a Doctrinal*. This distinction he lets us know is taken from the *Schools*. Then for the sake of a little Spirit and Elegance he talks in *Metaphorical* Mi-

inter illud quod in disputando adhibeatur, multum interesse statuit. In hoc genere quod in litibus usurpatur, *circum-ventione*, *fallaciis* ac *fraudibus*, in illo quod docet, *candori* tantum locum esse pessimè tuetur. *Vindic.* p. 170. ed. 2.

f Quin ut magis malè sanam hanc opinionem exornet, omnem antiquorum Doctorum catervam, Legatos *Christi*, & in his *Paulum* in oppugnandis adversariis Sophistarum artificiis fuisse usos, intolerandâ temeritate perhibet. *Ibid.*

g Aliud esse *ῥητορικῶς* scribere, aliud *δογματικῶς*.

litary^h terms, and represents a couple of Disputants as two Combatants. The Art, Dexterity, and various Postures of Defence of the one, he smartly describes and applies to the other. Not that the Cases are exactly parallel in every respect, but as *Similies* and *Metaphors* are usually interpreted with proper Abatements and Allowances, so he might reasonably expect that his should be interpreted as favourably. *Aut ferendum tibi est aut cadendum.* You must either strike, or fall, says Jerom. *Non possum te aestimare victorem, nisi adversarium videro trucidatum.* I cannot think you a conquerour, unless I see your adversary dispatch'd. No one, I suppose, upon this would tragically cry out, Murder and Bloodshed! But the *Metaphor*, bold and strong as it is, would easily be understood to mean no more, than that you cannot be compleatly victorious, if you are not *offensive* as well as *defensive*. It is not sufficient barely to repel his Arguments against you, but you must also overpower him with irresistible ones of your own against himⁱ. *Nolo tale certamen adeas, in quo tantum te protegas; and torpente dextrâ, sinistrâ clypeum cir-*

^h Patet campus, stat è contra acies, adversarii dogma manifestum est; & (ut *Virgilianum* aliquid inferam) illum aspice contra, qui vocat.

ⁱ This advice has lately been practis'd with great success in the Arian Controversy; where the excellent Defenders of our Saviour's Divinity have not only confuted the Objections against the Catholick Scheme, but loaded the Opposite with insuperable Difficulties.

cumferas.

cumferas. Don't engage, where you must only protect your self, and while your right hand is useless, move about a Shield with your left. After these he has more suspicious Expressions. Argumentari, ut Libet. Aliud loqui, aliud agere. Alibi minari, alibi percutere. Panem, ut dicitur, ostendere, lapidem tenere. Aliud querere, aliud definire. These are the words, in which Mosheim it seems, discerns a plain Confession of Ferom, se interdum mentiri solere, nec quæ sentiat in controversiis præsertim expromere. But the Father did not plead for such gross and unbounded Liberties in Disputes, neither is it equitable to fix such upon him, if his words may very naturally bear a more candid and innocent Interpretation. In these last Sentences Ferom is only setting forth the gymnastical way of Disputation among the Antients, and whatever Liberties he mentions, they are all to be referr'd to that. He does not once declare, that this was exactly his own Method of disputing, or that such a method was allowable in Controversy as to every particular. Some pertinence and relation to Ferom it certainly had, otherwise he would never have introduc'd it; but all he design'd by it, as I apprehend, was to give Pammachius and his other Readers some Idea of the Art and Management which is requisite in Dispute, and of that in particular which he himself had us'd against Jovinian. If he had assisted the Truth with some Strata-

gem, if he had puzzl'd his Adversary with en-
snaring Interrogatories, if he had drawn him in-
to pinching concessions, if he had laid some traps
in his way, if he had turn'd his own Argu-
ments against him, if he had kept himself a
little reserv'd and disguis'd, and at last by the
help of such an artificial Conduct had quite
distress'd and defeated his Opponent, the Na-
ture of these or any other controversial Poli-
cies were by his direction to be learnt from
the *Schools*. Here they were taught, explain'd,
and exercis'd for the Benefit of the *Youth*, to
sharpen their Wit, and clear their Understand-
ing, and to qualify them the better for the
Search and Defence of *Truth*. Hither there-
fore it was proper for *Jerom* to refer his Rea-
ders, because from them alone, and from no
other place or discipline could they judge so
well of his Conduct against *Jovinian*. But it
does not follow from hence, that St. *Jerom*
disputed with the same *degree* of Liberty and
Latitude, that was us'd in the *Schools*. The
Cases and Circumstances differ'd very much
in some respects, and of course the Form
and Behaviour must in some respects be
very different too. *Jerom* was serious in
the Argument, he oppos'd the tenets of
Jovinian as Errors in his *own* Opinion, and
earnestly contended for a Point which he
really believ'd to be true. But in the *Schools*
the *Opponent* often disputed in a feign'd Cha-
racter

rafter, oppos'd what was true in his private Judgment, and thought any *Fallacies, Tricks* and *Circumventions* lawful, which might serve to gain the Victory. In this respect then the *μυ-νασία* of the Schools was different from a serious Controversy; and in this respect it can never be prov'd, that *Ferom* intended to compare them. Turn and Sift his words as much as you please, they do not necessarily signify any more than the common and innocent *Arts* of Controversy, such as have subsisted in all Disputes quite from the time of *Socrates* down to the present. Never was there seen upon such occasions that *aperta frons & ingenuitas* (which *Ferom* speaks of) that *openness* and *plain-dealing*, which is usual in Lectures and Homilies. *Ferom* himself produces near twenty considerable Writers, that, it seems, were as little scrupulous as himself, and his List might easily be augmented by an Hundred more, And what is still more unaccountable, the greatest *Saints* of *Antient* and *Modern* Times have indulg'd themselves in the same kind of *Arts*, being in their Judgment very far from being *criminal*, from being *Frauds*, and *Lies*, and dishonest *circumventions*, but necessary to a clear and successful defence of *Truth* and *Virtue*.

To the other Passages cited above, *Ferom* adds at last, *Et hac dicerem, si vincendi studio,*
contra

*contra regulam Scripturarum quidpiam locutus fu-
issem. And this, says he, should be my plea, if
in my eagerness for Victory, I had said any thing
contrary to the rule of Scripture. Some one per-
haps might suspect from hence, that Jerom
thought himself and any others at Liberty to
vent in Dispute any falsehoods tho' contrary to
Scripture itself, if the Victory could be gain'd
by it. For tho' he denies himself to be guilt-
ty of such male-practice in the present instance,
yet he may seem to allow it as lawful, when-
ever it should be convenient. But a word or
two following soon after entirely destroys this
whole suggestion. For Jerom himself confes-
ses, that if he had done any such thing, it de-
serv'd no better name than culpa. Et, sicut
viri fortes in Controversiis solent facere, culpam
premio redimerem. By all which then he would
only intimate, that if thro' Heat or Inadver-
tency some unguarded and exceptionable ex-
pression should happen to fall from him, the
reason and occasion of it would excuse him,
such slips being often incident to Disputes.*

THO' what has been said, is, I hope, suffi-
cient to wipe off the Aspersions of the Learn-
ed Mosheim upon Jerom, yet it may receive
some useful Illustrations from Antiquity.

St. Jerom in his Defense of his Book against
Jovinian has several allusions to the antient
Forms

Forms of Disputation, and makes frequent use of *Terms* which belong peculiarly to them. This has occasion'd obscurities in some things to us now, which in his time were clear and familiar enough to every Scholar.

THUS he calls the question in Dispute between him and Jovinian a *problem*^k, which we learn from *Aristotle*^l, *Boethius*^m, and *Joannes Sarisberiensis*ⁿ was a Technical word of the Schools. From hence he has borrow'd likewise his *γυμναστικῶς scribere & δογματικῶς*, which cannot be clearly understood without recourse to the antient *Dialectice*. It was antiently ° the way to discuss any *Question* of importance not by writing *pro* and *con* upon it, but by a verbal dispute. Here the Disputants were allow'd to oppose and distress one another with as much Acuteness, Subtlety, and Art as they were Masters of. Only the Law between them was, to dispute δι' ἐνδόξων *per probabilia*, which were Arguments drawn from Princi-

k Si bene *problematis* memini, inter *Jovinianum* & nos ista contentio est.

l Topic. L. 1. c. 11.
n Metalog. L. 2. c. 15.

m Different. Top. L. 1.

ο Γυμνασίαν, ἥτις τὴν γινομένην ἐν πρὸς
διαλέμαδι ὡς πῖνας διχομήνου γὰρ πῖνα ἀποβλήματα παρὰ τῶν ἀποσ-
διαλεχθέντων, γυμναζόμενοι πειρῶνται τέτοις παρίστασι, δι' ἐνδόξων τὰς
ἐπιχειρήσεις ποιούμενοι ἢ τὴν εἰς ἐκάτερον μέρος ἐπιχείρησιν. Ἡ δὲ συνήθεια τὸ
τοῦτοι εἶδος τῶν λόγων ἈΡΧΑΙΟΙΣ, καὶ τὰς συνουσίας τὰς πλείους
τῶν ἐπιπῶντο τὸν τρόπον, ὅτι ἐπὶ βιβλίων ὥσπερ νῦν, εἰδὲ γὰρ ἦν
πῶ τίτι τοιαῦτα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ δίσεως πρὸς τιθείας εἰς ταῦτα γυμ-
νάζοντες αὐτῶν τὸ πρὸς τὰς ἐπιχειρήσεις εὐρετικόν, ἐπιχειρῶν κατασκευ-
άζοντες καὶ ἀνασκευάζοντες δι' ἐνδόξων τὸ κείμενον. *Alexand. Aphrod.*
in *Top. Aristot.* p. 16. Ed. *Grac.*

ples

ples and Notions^p generally acknowledg'd to be true. This sort of engagement was call'd *γυμνασία* ^q, because it was an *Exercise* to the rational Faculties, and call'd forth all the Acumen, Sagacity, and Invention of the brightest Wits upon the occasion. It was likewise call'd *ζήτησις* an *enquiry*^r; (to which St. *Ferom*'s *querere* alludes) because it was design'd by examining and canvassing a question on all sides as a proper means for the discovery of Truth. *Alexander Aphrodisiensis* informs^r us, that in his time there were extant some Books of *Aristotle* and *Theophrastus* compos'd in this way, in imitation, I imagine, of the *old* Disputations in use before them. *Laertius*^t also has preserv'd the *Titles* of several Books which seem to have been of this kind. If any such pieces had been preserv'd to this Day, they, no doubt, would have given great Light into this Affair. However by these little Notices of them, we find what Tracts St. *Ferom* refers us to, when he bids^u us read *Aristotle* and *Theophrastus* for Instances of the *γυμνασία*.

p Ἐνδύεα τὰ δικύντα πᾶσιν, ἢ τοῖς πλείοσι, ἢ τοῖς σοφοῖς. Καὶ τῷτοις, ἢ πᾶσιν, ἢ τοῖς πλείοσι, ἢ τοῖς μάλιστα γνωρίμοις πᾶσι ἐνδύοις.
Id. ib. p. 12.

q See *Alexand.* Ibid.

r Id. ib. p. 262. Τοῖς ζητήσεως καὶ γυμνασίας χάριν κοινολογούμενοις.

f Καὶ ἐπὶ δὲ βιβλία τοιαῦτα Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Θεοφράστου γυμναστικά, ἔχοντα τὴν εἰς τὰ ἀντικείμενα δι' ἐνδύων ἐπιχείρησιν.
In Top. *Aristot.* p. 16.

t Lib. v. in *Aristot. & Theophr.*

u Legite—*Theophrastum*—*Aristotelem.* ub. sup.

It is farther to be observ'd, that the Λόγοι γυμναστικοὶ the *gymnastical discourses* were quite of a different kind from those, which had the name of ἐριστικοὶ and σοφιστικοὶ the *Contentious and Sophistical*. In the former *Truth* was the End and Business of the Dispute, and the strictest regard was expected to it. In the latter the Contest was for *Victory and Gain*, and so little concern did there appear for *Truth*, that it often was sacrific'd to the other two.

Thus are they plainly distinguish'd by *Aristotle*^a and *Alexander*^b. And from hence it was, that the οἱ σοφισταὶ and the οἱ ἐριστικοὶ became so odious and contemptible in the following Ages. *They studied nothing else, says Cresollius*^c, but to gain the Victory. An *St. Austin*^d gives them no better Character, than that of *libido rixandi, & puerilis ostentatio decipiendi adversarium*.

It is therefore a great mistake of *Le Clerc*^e to conclude that *St. Jerom*, because he speaks

a Ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὸ πρῶγμα διαρῶν τὰ κοινὰ (or rather, as *Alexander* reads it, Τὸ πρῶγμα διαρῶν κατὰ τὰ κοινὰ) διαλεκτικὸς (i. e. γυμναστικὸς) ἐστίν. — Οἱ τῆς ΝΙΚΗΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ χάριν ποιεῖται (i. e. ἀπατητικὸς καὶ ἄδικος, *ibid.*) ἐριστικὸς ἄνθρωπος ἔ φιλέει δὲ ἀκούειν εἰς τὴν οἱ δὲ δόξης χάριν τῆς εἰς ΧΡΗΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΝ σοφιστικοί. *Sophist. Elench. L. 1. c. 11.* b Οἱ μὲν ἐριστικοὶ χάριν νίκης καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν περισσῶτων δόξης εὖτε ποιεῖται, οἱ δὲ σοφισταὶ χάριν χρηματισμοῦ καὶ πλεονεξίας. — Ὁ διαλεκτικὸς καὶ ἐν δεικνύων καὶ ἐξ ὧτων συλλογίζεται. *Alex. in Elench. Soph. Aristot. p. 31. Ed. Græc.*

c Hoc unum studebant, ut vicisse viderentur. *Theat. Rhetor. L. 3. p. 68.* d Doctrin. *Christ. L. 2. c. 48,*

e Art. Crit. Vol. 1: p. 491.

M

of

of writing γυμναστικῶς, openly professes to use *sophistry*. *Aperitè Sophisticeu se adhibere proficitur*. For it is as visible as *Antient Writers* can make it, that *Sophistry* was never admitted into the Λόγῳ γυμναστικοί, where the Disputants were always oblig'd to argue δι' ἐνδόξων, that is, from things esteem'd *morally* certain tho' not necessarily true^f. The *sophistical Argument* on the contrary was said to be drawn ἐκ τῶν φανομένων ἐνδόξων from only *apparent* moral Evidence, to distinguish it from *real*.

THERE was still another sort of Disputation, which they call'd ἡ πειραστική, a species indeed of the ἡ διαλεκτική, but differing from it in one respect, as it did not confine the Disputant to Arguments strictly just and true in themselves, but allow'd him to go entirely upon *false* positions and Principles, if they happen'd to be such as his adversary^s admitted and believ'd. The particular use of this way of reasoning was to shew^h the ignorance of an Adversary, and confute him more effectually. But nothing was intended to be

^f See *Alexander* in *Top. Aristot.* p. 10, 11, 12.

g Ὁ ΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ—τὴν διαφέρειν τῇ διαλεκτικῇ, ὅτι ὁ μὲν διαλεκτικὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀπλῶς ἐνδόξων, ὁ δὲ ΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ ἐκ τῶν ἀποκρινόμενων δοκούντων. *Alexand.* in *Top* p. 14.

h Οἱ πειραστικοὶ πρὸς ὈΦΕΛΕΙΑΝ τοῦ προσηγορευμένου τὸ πρᾶγμα εἰδέναι, μὴ εἰδέναι δὲ, λόγους ποιῶμενοι, ἐλέγχουσι μὲν τὸν ἀποκρινόμενον, εἰς ἀντιφάσεις συνθλίβουσιν αὐτόν· ἀλλ' ἐκ ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων τὸ πρᾶγμα περὶ ὧν τὰς λόγους ποιῶνται. ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν δοκούντων μὲν αἰώνων εἶναι, μὴ ἔντων δέ. *Id.* in *Soph. Elench.* p. 23.

gain'd or secur'd by it but *Truth*, which, they thought would be likely to make the stronger impressions on the Adversary, the more weak and indefensible the opposite scheme should appear. Therefore it was usual for him who was superior to the other, and disputed with him chiefly to correct and instruct him, not so much to explain and defend his own Opinions of things, as to find out those of his Adversary, and by putting many questions to him, and receiving his answers, to confute him at last out of his own Mouth.

Alexander observes^l, that this way of Argumentation is very frequent in the Dialogues of *Plato*; and *Quintilian*^k informs us, that some of them are properly ἐλεγκτικοὶ *elenctical*, others δογματικοὶ *doctrinal*. And what is more remarkable, *Quintilian* makes this distinction of them, to account for some harsh expressions in *Plato* against *Rhetorick*, which for want of attention to the time and way of speaking had been much misinterpreted by many. How great a resemblance is there between the case of *Plato* and *Ferom*! *Ferom*'s Book against *Jovinian* was ἐλεγκτικός, as well as *Plato*'s *Gorgias*

^l Πόλυ γὰρ περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς εἶδος καὶ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ ΕΥΡΕΙΝ (Deest, "Επὶ) ΕΝ ΑΠΑΣΙ ἀρετῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ψαλῶν. Ibid. p. 8. ἔχοντες γὰρ πολλὴν ἀφρονίαν, ὡς ἐν τῷ Πρωτοκράτει καὶ Γοργίᾳ καὶ τῇς ἄλλαις διαλέγουσι τοῦ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ. Ibid. p. 24.

^k Alii sunt ejus sermones ad arguendos qui contra disputant compositi, quos ἐλεγκτικὸς vocant, alii ad præcipiendum qui δογματικοὶ appellantur. Inst. Orat. I. 2. c. 16.

or any other. *Plato* (or *Socrates*) in dispute had drop'd some exceptionable expressions as well as *Ferom*. *Quintilian* explains and vindicates *Plato* from the Nature of the Discourse. Why therefore may not *Ferom* be treated and expounded with equal favour? Especially, when the *Father* makes such an *Apology* himself, and desires the Reader to accept it. Thus much at least we may affirm, that if *Ferom* must be charg'd with *Frauds* and *Lies* and I know not what, only because he writes sometimes γυμναστικῶς in a *gymnastical* way, neither *Plato* nor any one else can be acquitted, that writes ἐλεγκτικῶς in the *elenctical*, both these ways of Writing being in a manner the same, and equally exclude *Ingenuity* and *Honesty*. In short, I know no better way of clearing *St. Ferom's* conduct in this particular, than by saying in one word, that all the *serious* Disputes that ever subsisted, or at least all that have fallen within our knowledge, have been so many different γυμνασῖαι, and are chargeable even on the side of the fairest Controvertists with those sorts of Practices, which are so offensive in *Ferom*.

BEFORE I conclude this Head, I cannot forbear taking notice of the Censures, which the Learned *Mosheim* has pass'd of the same kind on other antient Writers. He's afraid, he says,

says, that the greatest and most pious Doctors of the IVth. Century might be found upon a strict examination to teach, that it is Virtue, to deceive and Lye, if the Interest of Religion requires it. He does not except even Ambrose, Hilary, and Chrysostom *. I am far from the least suspicion of any ill Design in the Learned Mosheim, but I cannot acquit Him of Injustice to the Characters of those great and good Men, in making such gross insinuations without any proof, and without any Exception and Reserve. He calls this Doctrine of the Fathers an *Error*, and expresses a dread of finding it in the greatest *Saints*. What can the Reader conclude from hence, but that these *Fathers* allow'd a sort of *Lying* and *Deceit* which is strictly *immoral* and *criminal*, and condemn'd by the ablest *Casuits* of modern times? Whereas I may appeal to Mosheim himself, whether these very *Fathers* do not often explode, disclaim, and condemn *Lying* in Terms as strong and explicit as possible. So Hilary. *Let the very suspicion of a Lye cease. For it becomes the Ministers of Truth to speak the Truth*¹. So Am-

* Metuo ego, ne qui curiosius exploraturi sunt maximorum ac sanctissimorum hujus sæculi Doctorum scripta, omnes prope modum in hoc errore (*sc. fallendi & mentiendi, si res ita poscat Religionis.*) deprehendant. Non Ambrosium, non Hilarium, non Chrysostomum excipio. *Institut. Hist. Eccl.* p. 284.

¹ Cesset maledictorum opinio, & mendacii suspicio. *Veritatis* enim ministros decet *vera* proferre. *Cont. Constant.* §. 6.

brose. *All Fraud is base^m. And a Lye in words is baseⁿ.* So Chrysostom. *Let us not Lye, if we are Members one of another. This is a sign of Friendship, but the contrary of Hatred. Let no one deceive his Neighbour^o.* But the whole Truth and Mystery of the matter is this, that *mentiri* among the *Latins* signified either barely to tell an Untruth, or to tell a Lye, and *fallere* signified either to deceive injuriously or not. In the same ambiguous sense *ψεύδεσθαι* and *ἀπατᾶν* were us'd among the *Greeks*. From whence it happen'd, that the same Man might allow both *fallere* and *mentiri* in one sense, and condemn it in another. All Fables, Apologues, Parables, Allegories, Ironies, Hyperboles, and Metaphors, are all deviations from Truth, and were often call'd by the *Antients* *ψεύδη*, and commended as useful for being so, and attributed to the Scriptures themselves as Beauties and Excellencies. But have they the nature of Lies and Frauds, or do we abhor them any more than the *Antients*? So again. Fictions are us'd with Children, Ideots, and Madmen to allure them to what is Good, and deter them from what is Evil; not with any view of doing them any injury, but with a generous and charitable de-

m Turpis est itaque omnis fraus. De Off. L. 3. c. 9.

n Mendacium in verbo turpe est. Epist. 69.

ο ἡμεῖς μὴ ψευδόμεθα, εἰ ἀλλήλων μίση ἴσμεν. τοῦτο φιλίας
παμύθητον, τὸ δὲ ἡἀντίον ἔχοντες. — Μηδεὶς ἀπατάτω τὸν πλησίον.
In Ephes. c. 4. λογ. 10.

p Euseb. Prep. Evang. Lib. 11. cap. 4. 34.

sign of preventing them from injuring themselves. Now these common Fictions are *Falsities* and *Deceptions*, they are *ψῦδος* and *ἀπαται*, *mendacia* & *fallacia*, yet few would be so rigorous as to charge them with the baseness and deformity of *Lies*. Again. A *Physician* may impose upon a *Patient* in order to cure his disease, and an *honest* Man upon a *Villain* to save the innocent. Here there is *Falshood* and *Deceit* in both instances; yet it is a doubt with the *greatest* Men of the *Moderns*, whether such impositions have in them the guilt and formality of *Lies*. Again. We disguise and dissemble our thoughts in some cases, we even make use of *Simulation* and *Feints* in some circumstances, by which we may occasion some misapprehensions concerning us in other Persons, yet tho' there is a manifest *fallacia* in all these *Arts*, they have not been unanimously determin'd to be absolutely dishonest and criminal. So that we have not sufficient ground for censuring the *Fathers*, merely because they speak of a *ψῦδος* and *ἀπαται*, *fallere* & *mentiri*, unless the nature and circumstances of them appear to be such as are really unjustifiable. For my own part I never could observe, that the *Fathers* were looser *Casuits* in this respect, than *Grotius*, *Puffendorf*, *Barbeyrac*, and the late Learned Dr. *Moss*. If these Men, who had studied the point of *Lying* with particular Care and exactness, did not think it unlawful *falle-*

re & mentiri in some cases, I see no reason for crying out so violently against the *Fathers* for the *same* Doctrine. To make this matter still clearer, and to render the *Antients* less suspected, I will draw out such passages of them, as 'tis probable, *Mosheim* alluded to, and confront them with others of our celebrated *Moderns*.

CLEMENS ALEX.

Ἀληθὲς τι φρονεῖ ἄμα, καὶ ἀληθεύει (γνώσις), πλην ἐμὴ ποτὶ ἐν θεραπείας μέρει, καθάπερ ἰατρὸς νοσοῦντας ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν καμνόντων, ψεύσεται ἢ ψεύδους ἐρεῖ, κατὰ τῆς σοφιστίας. Strom. Lib. 7. p. 863. Ed. Potter.

HILARIUS PICTAV.

Artum hoc, & per sæculi nequitias & vitia difficile iter est. Est enim necessarium plerumque mendacium, & nonnunquam falsitas utilis est, cum aut percussuro de latente mentimur, aut testimonium pro periclitante frustramur, aut fallimus de difficultate curationis ægrotum. In Psalm. p. 65. Ed. Ben.

CHRYSOSTOMUS.

Οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις μένον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ πολλὴν καὶ ἀναγκαίαν ἔντροις τις ἀντὶ τῆς ἀπάτης τὴν χρείαν. Καὶ ὁ πρὸς τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα μένον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ πρὸς ἄνδρα γυναικί, καὶ πατρὶ πρὸς υἱόν, καὶ πρὸς φίλον

GROTIUS.

Primum est, etiamsi quid dicatur quod falsam habeat significationem infanti aut amenti, in eo mendacii culpam non esse. Videtur enim communi omnium hominum sensu permissum esse,

Ut puerorum atas improvida iudificetur.]

Secundum est, quoties sermo ad eum dirigitur qui non decipitur, etiamsi tertius inde falsam hauriat persuasionem, nullum esse mendacium. Non ratione ejus ad quem sermo est, quia illi libertas manet integra, planè ut illis quibus id intelligentibus fabula narratur, aut apud quos profertur sermo figuratus. —Ad hoc genus *Chrysostomus* & *Hieronymus* retulerunt *Pauli* sermonem, quo *Antiochia Petrum* ut nimium judaizantem reprehendit. Censent enim *Petrum* satis intellexisse non id seriò fieri; interim verò consultum infirmitati adstantium.

Tertium est, quoties certum est eum ad quem sermo est, libertatis suæ in judicando læsionem non

φιλαί, ἡδὲ καὶ πρὸς πατέρα πατρός. — Προσλαμβάνει τὴν τῶν ἰατρῶν ἐρώτη-
σιν, πῶς ἀπαλλάττονται τῆς νόσου
τῆς κάματοις; καὶ ἀκροῖται παρ'
αὐτῶν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀρκούντες τῇ τέχνῃ
μόνῃ, ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ὅπου καὶ τὰ ἀπά-
την προσλαμβάνουσιν, καὶ τὴν παρ'
αὐτῆς βοήθειαν καταμιζάντας, ὥστε
ἐπὶ τῇ ὑγίαιν τῆς ἀδυνατούντος ἐ-
κινῶνται. Ὅτι ἂν γὰρ τὰ δυστέ-
ριστον τῶν ἀρρώστων, καὶ τῆς νόσου
ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ δυστάπτον μὴ προσέ-
ηται τὰς τῶν ἰατρῶν συμβουλὰς,
καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀπάτης ἐπαυθῆναι ὡς
ἀποπαιεῖν ἀνάγκη. ἐν ᾧ περὶ ἐπὶ
τῆς σκεπτικῆς τῶν τῶν γινώσκοντων ἀ-
λήθειαν κρύψαι δύνασθαι. — Οὐ μὲν
οἱ δὲ τῆς πλ. σώματα διακρί-
νουν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τῶν ψυχῶν
καταστάσεων ἐπιμελομένους εὖροι τις
ἐν συνεκτικῇ τῇ κατεργασίᾳ τῆς
φαρμάκων. Οὗτοι τὰς πολλὰς μυ-
ριάδας ἐκείνας τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὁ
μακάριος προσηγάγο Παῦλος.
Μιστὶ ταύτης τῆς προαιρέσεως τὸν
Τιμέριον περιέπαινον, ὁ Γαλάταις
ἐπιστέλλον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἔδωκεν ἀφελῆσαι
τῆς περιπεμπομένων. Διὰ τοῦτο
ὑπὸ νόμον ἐγένετο, ὁ ζήμιον ἡσού-
μενος μετὰ τὴν εἰς χρεῖσιν πίσιν τὴν
ἀπὸ τοῦ Νόμου δικαιούμενον. Πο-
λὴ γὰρ ἡ τῆς ἀπάτης ἰσχὺς· μόνον
ΜΗ μετὰ ΔΟΛΕΡΑΣ προσηγάγω
ὡς προαιρέσεως. Μᾶλλον δὲ ἐπὶ ἀπάτην
τὸ πικρὸν δὲ καλεῖται, ἀλλ' οἰκτο-
μίαν τίνας, καὶ σφίαν, καὶ πικρὴν
ἐκκλήν πολλὰς πίκρας ἐν ταῖς ἀπό-
ροις ὑπάρχειν, καὶ πλημμελείας ἐπα-
κινῶσαι ψυχῆς. De Sacerdot.
Lib. i. p. 369, 370. Ed. Ben.

non ægrè laturum, imo gratias
habiturum eo nomine, ob com-
modum aliquod quod inde asse-
quitur, tunc quoque mendacium
strictè dictum, id est injuriosum
non committi. — Sic ergo non vi-
detur peccare, qui aut ægrotan-
tem amicum persuasione non
verâ solatur, — aut in prælio pe-
riclitanti ex falso nuntio ani-
mum addit, quo incitatus vi-
ctoriam & salutem sibi pariat.

Quartum & superiori affine
est, quoties qui habet jus super-
eminens in omnia jura alterius,
eo jure bono ipsius sive proprio
sive publico utitur.

Quintum esse potest, quoties
Vita innocentis aut par aliquid
aliter servari, & alter ab im-
probi facinoris perfectione ali-
ter averti non potest. *Jur.
Bell. & Pac. Lib. 3. cap. 1.
§. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.*

PUFFENDORF.

All in general, upon whom
we cannot by plain Speech ob-
tain the good we design, we may
without the censure of Lying,
by feign'd Addresses lead into a
mistake, for their own Interest
and Safety. In these Cases we
ought as much to accommodate
our Discourse to the Temper and
Condition of the Hearer, as Phy-
sicians do their Medicines to the
Patient's Strength and Constitu-
tion. — All such feign'd Speeches,
as either save or protect Inno-
cence, appease Grief or procure
any Benefit or Convenience to
others, which could not have
been obtain'd by direct and open
Expressi-

CASSIAN.

Taliter de mendacio sentiendum, atque ita eo utendum est, quasi natura ei insit Ellebori. Quod si imminente exitiali morbo sumptum fuerit, fit salubre; cæterum absque summi discriminis necessitate perceptum præsentis exitii est. — Quando grave aliquod imminet de veritatis confessione discrimen; tunc mendaciorum sunt recipienda perfugia. — Ubi autem nulla conditio summæ necessitatis incumbit, omni cautione mendacium velut mortiferum devitandum est. *Collat. xvii. cap. 17.* Tunc necessario ac veniabiliter acquiescitur mendacii detrimento, quando majus, ut diximus, imminet de veritatis confessione dispendium, & utilitas quæ nobis de veritate confertur, compensare illa quæ generanda sunt damna non prævalet. *Ibid. cap. 20.*

Expressions, are not only to be exempted from the number of Lyes, but to be applauded as so many Instances of Wisdom. Law of Nat. Book. 4. c. 1. §. 16. See his particular Confirmation of Grotius's Cases. Ibid.

BARBEYRAC.

When we make use of Speech in behalf of our selves, either to secure or defend ourselves, or to procure ourselves some innocent Advantage, which neither entrenches upon the Glory of God, nor the Rights of our Neighbour, in this case 'tis not only permitted, but expressly ordain'd by the Law of Nature, either to speak the Truth, or be silent; or to feign or dissemble, as a lawful Defence of ourselves, or our innocent Advantage requires. — As often as they to whom we speak have no right to require of us to speak freely what we think, we do them no Injury if we conceal the Truth from them. And so the disguising of the Truth has not the principal Property of a Lye, &c. Not. in Puffend. ubi sup. §. 7.

Dr. *Moss* discourses on this Subject in the following manner. — ‘There is indeed a general Obligation upon us all, to speak simple, and unsophisticated Truth; because Truth is generally the best, and nearest Way to arrive at the primary Ends of rational Society; and both to impart, and secure the Benefits of it to each other. But what if Truth, through
‘the

POSTSCRIPT. 99

'the Perverseness of the Persons concerned,
 'or ill Posture, or Extremity of the Case,
 'should instead of being subservient to these
 'Ends, necessarily frustrate, and destroy them,
 'Must we still be obliged to speak Truth a-
 'gainst the true Design of it; and not to
 'recede one Tittle from it, for Fear of incur-
 'ring the Guilt, and Censure of *Lying*? I am
 'not averse from thinking, that there may be
 'Room for a more favourable Construction,
 'and Reason too. For though every the least
 'Deviation from Truth, is confessedly a Fals-
 'hood; yet every Falshood is not injuriously
 'deceitful, which is the noxious Composition
 'of a Lye. And therefore it does not deserve
 'rashly to be called by so ill-favour'd a Name;
 'especially when effectual Care is taken either
 'to prevent the Deceit itself, that might arise
 'from such Falshood, or any possible Injury
 'that might redound from it; but most of all,
 'when by a happy Dexterity, it is adapted to
 'supply the Defects, and answer the Purposes
 'of Truth itself; by usefully instructing, and
 'powerfully persuading those, that could not
 'be otherwise so well wrought upon; by
 'cleverly diverting an imminent Mischief, res-
 'cuing an innocent Person, &c.

'BUT this will be seen in particular Instan-
 'ces. Let that familiar one, of the usual Me-
 'thod of Parents in managing Children be

'the first. There are few, I believe, that scruple to allure them to what is Good, and to deter them from Evil, by such apposite Fictions, as are most likely to make Impressions upon them; especially when they find them otherwise untractable. The Reason of which, as *Grotius* thinks, is this; that they have no Capacity to judge of Truth, and consequently they have no Right to it; nor are they wronged in being deprived of it. But as *Pufendorf* judiciously enough remarks, they have certainly a Right to Truth, so far, as that scanty Capacity they have will admit of it: But without all Peradventure they have a Right not to be injured by Falshood.

'AND if Truth and Goodness may be most commodiously conveyed into their weak Minds, under a fabulous Dress, they are deceiv'd indeed, though not to their Prejudice, but Advantage; much by the same Stratagem, that they are tempted to take the Food, or Physic, that is salutary for them; by mingling it with something that is pleasant to the Taste. And he must be a rigid *Cassius* indeed, that will pronounce every Parent, an Errant Lyar, for so useful, and innocent an Indulgence to his Child.

'IN like Manner, Suppose a Physician, or any Friend should so far humour the Imagination

'nation of a Lunatic, fancying himself to be
'a Prince, as to shew him *Bedlam*, and per-
'suade him 'tis his Palace, and by that Means
'get him safe lodg'd there, in order to his
'Cure; shall this friendly, and charitable Of-
'fice pass under the Character of a Lye? Surely
'no! For 'tis evident in this Case, that Truth
'itself, had it been nakedly propos'd, would
'have been injurious to him, and enraged his
'Distemper; and no Man can have a Right
'to be injured, though it be by Truth itself.
'And therefore, if he was by a dexterous De-
'vice, inveigled into the Place that was fittest
'for him; there was no Wrong done to any
'Body; nothing indeed, but what all his
'Friends, or those who have any Pity for him,
'and even he himself, if he should recover his
'Senses, would be thankful for.

'AGAIN, There is another Case, though not
'very like this, that in *Grotius's* Judgment will
'deserve Favour; and that is, when two Per-
'sons are conferring about Matters, which it
'imports them to keep secret; if another
'should plant himself at the same Time, with
'an insidious Design to overhear them; it is
'lawful (says our Author) so to frame their
'Discourse, as that the other shall collect no-
'thing from it, but what is quite beside their
'Meaning. The Reason assigned for it is this,
'that though every Man owes the Debt of
'Truth

' Truth to another, so far as their mutual Com-
 ' merce, or Correspondence may require; yet
 ' no Man is bound to publish his Secrets
 ' to every Body, that is inquisitive after them.
 ' And on the other Hand, if he that has no
 ' Right to know another's Secrets, shall out
 ' of an evil Curiosity, endeavour to pick them
 ' up in the Dark (as it were) by Stealth; if
 ' a Mistake is laid in his Way in their Stead,
 ' there can be no Wrong done, since there was
 ' no Right on his Part existing; and therefore,
 ' if he suffer by that mistake, he has only him-
 ' self to thank for it. But then if we make
 ' Use of this Allowance, we must remember
 ' to take this Caution along with it, that 'tis
 ' unlawful for two Persons to enter into a
 ' Confederacy, on Purpose to entice a third
 ' into a Snare, in which they hope to catch
 ' him, for no other End, but to delude him,
 ' and expose him.

' Thus again, in Case a Fire should break
 ' out in the Neighbourhood of a Woman lying
 ' in Child-bed; 'tis lawful, as well as prudent
 ' I reckon, to conceal it from her, and even
 ' to possess her to the contrary, if she should
 ' apprehend it, 'till the Danger is over. And
 ' the plain Reason is, because it concerns her
 ' less in her present Condition, to be depriv'd
 ' of the Knowledge of the real Truth, than to
 ' avoid the Inconvenience of a sudden Fright:
 ' And

‘And therefore her Consent might fairly be
‘presumed upon, to part with her Right to
‘the one, rather than suffer under the ill
‘Effects of the other: And they who deal
‘with her upon this Presumption, are so far
‘from being injurious, that ’tis the kindest
‘Office they could do her.

‘AND as for that famous Instance of an in-
‘nocent Person furiously pursued, by his Blood-
‘thirsty Enemy; I can’t but think, that ’tis
‘both lawful, and laudable to misinform, or
‘misdirect the Pursuer. For I cannot divine
‘for my Part, wherein the Wrong should lie;
‘tis certain no Man can have a Right to be
‘a Murderer; and therefore he is not wrong’d
‘sure, when he is hinder’d from embruing
‘his Hands in Blood; nay, when he is hin-
‘dred in Part, from contracting all that horri-
‘ble Guilt upon himself, which in his Fury
‘he would have done. And ’tis absurd to
‘say, that ’tis an Injury to an innocent Man,
‘to preserve his Life for him. And therefore
‘I can’t see, how the Imputation of a *Lye*
‘(whose Nature it is to be injurious) should be
‘fastened upon a merciful, and a charitable
‘Untruth; that prevents a more grievous Mis-
‘chief, and confers the most valuable Kind-
‘ness, without interfering with any Body’s
‘Right, or procuring any Body’s Wrong’.*

* Sermons Vol. 2. Sermon 10.

Thus far these Learned Writers; under whose protection I hope the *Fathers* may shelter *their fallere & mentiri*; if any thing worse can be *prov'd* upon them, which cannot be admitted till *prov'd* very clearly, I am ready with the first to resign them up to Censure and Invective.

I shall not stay now to examine, what the same Learned *Mosheim* has deliver'd in another place, that the *Christian Doctors* receiv'd *their fallacious Turn* from the *Rhetoric Schools* and from the *Platonists* *. As he seems by a Note in his Margin † to promise a large Discourse on that Subject, I chuse to wave at present the particular Reasons and Authorities, which persuade me to dissent from Him in this Point, and haste to a Conclusion. All we desire is, just and candid Representations, without any disguising Colours, and studied Aggravations. Let the Appeal be to Reason, Equity and Truth, and by their Decisions let all these Disputes be adjusted and determined.

* *Christiani Doctores in Ludis Rhetorum instituti, nil referre discebant in illis, dolo Hostis an Virtute caderet. Quare novum quoddam disputandi genus cum Adversariis, quod Oeconomicum appellabant, adoptarunt, cui non tam veritas quam victoria erat proposita. Instit. Hist. Eccl. p. 186.*

† Dum id ipse fusiùs probem, inspicatur *Jo. Dallaus &c.*

A D D E N D A.

Ad p. 18. To confirm my Interpretation of the Word *Corpus* in *Tertullian* and others, I will here produce a remarkable Passage of the Great *Ptolemy*; wherein he tells us, that *Body* signified with several Philosophers whatever is capable of *Action* or *Passion*; which makes it answer exactly to our Word *Substance*, and therefore it might be equally used of *immaterial* Beings and *material*.

The Philosopher's Words are these, speaking of the various ὀνομασίαι, or *Appellations* of Things. Ἡ μὲν νῦν (sc. ὀνομασία) τὴν ψυχὴν ἀσώματον εἶναι φάσκει κατὰ τὰς νομοθετῶντας σώμα καλεῖσθαι τὸ αἰσθησὶ γινώριμον, *one way of Speaking determines the Soul to be incorporeal, according to those who assert Body to be a Thing perceptible by Sensation*; νῦν δὲ σῶμα, κατὰ τὰς τὸ ποιῆσαι καὶ παθεῖν οἰόντες ὀριζομένους, *But another makes it a Body, according to those who define Body to be a Thing capable of Action or Passion*. Ptol. de Judic. Facultat. p. 13. Ed. Bulliald. I say in the *Translation or Passion*, tho' literally in the *Greek* it is, *and Passion*, because the Sense of the Definition requires evidently such a Construction, and the Particle καὶ has often the same disjunctive Signification.

Again, to shew that other Writers among the Ancients used the Word σῶμα *Body*, to signify a Being *finite* in Extension and Power, the Reader may consult the old acute Author of the *Questions and Answers to the Greeks*, publish'd with *Justin Martyr*. Edit. Par. 1615. p. 194, 203, 204.

A D D E N D A

It is to be observed that the Word *Body* is used in various senses. I will here produce a remarkable Passage of the Greek Physician, wherein he tells us that *Body* is limited with several Philosophers; whatever is capable of Motion or Passion; which makes it answer exactly to our Word *Substance*, and therefore it might be equally used of immaterial Beings and material.

The Philosophers Words are those speaking of the various operation of the various Things. He says (in Greek) *το σώμα* is that which is capable of motion and passion, and is not limited to any one operation, one way of speaking determines the Soul to be immaterial, according to those who affect Body to be a Thing perceptible by sensation; but it cannot have the no motion; rather shows opposition. But another makes it a Body, according to those who affect Body to be a Thing capable of Motion or Passion. From the Latin Faculties. p. 13. Ed. Bingham. It is in the Translation of Paffon, the Faculty in the Greek is *δύναμις*, and Paffon, because the Sense of the Definition requires evidently such a Construction, and the Particle *εἰ* has often the same distinctive signification.

I going to show that other Writers among the Ancients used the Word *Body* to signify a being finite in Extension and Power, the Reader may consult the old acute Author of the *Philosophy* and *Metaphysics* to the Greek, published with James Mair's. Edn. Paris 1615. p. 104. 105. 106.

REMARKS

ON A

LETTER

TO

Dr. *WATERLAND*.

Printed first in the Year MDCC XXXI.

L O N D O N

Printed for S. BENT, at the Bible and Ball
in St. Mary-Lane.

REMARKS



LETTER

TO

DR. WATERLAND.

Printed first in the Year MDC XXXI.

REMARKS
ON A
LETTER
TO
Dr. *WATERLAND*,
In RELATION to the
Natural Account
OF
LANGUAGES.

The THIRD EDITION.

BY
PHILOBIBLICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

L O N D O N:

Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball
in *Ave-Mary-Lane*. MDCCLXII.

REMARKS

ON A

LETTER

TO

DR. WATKINS

In Reply to the



Natural Account

OF

LANGUAGES.

The Third Edition.

BY

PHILIPPS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

L O N D O N :

Printed for S. Birt, at the Bible and Ball
in New-Market Lane. MDCCLXXII.

P R E F A C E.

THE following Pages being drawn up occasionally, in Opposition to a few general Paragraphs only in a small Pamphlet, the Author did not think himself concern'd to enter farther into the Subject of Languages for that Time, than the present Occasion might seem to require; and for that Reason contented himself with correcting the defective and fallacious Accounts, which had been given of the Sentiments of the Learned upon the Point, and with dropping a few short Hints upon the main Question, as Principles or the Ground-work to a larger Treatise, if any deeper Prosecution of the Point had been render'd necessary.

But no Reply being offer'd to this Tract on the other Side, tho' strongly and often urg'd to it by several ingenious Writers, the little Piece was left to the Reader in its first Draught without any subsequent Illustration or Enlargement. And 'tis presumed, from the favourable Reception it has met with already, that though the Sentiments it espouses on the ancient Diversity of Tongues, are not here re-
pre-

REMARKS

ON A

LETTER

TO

DR. WATKINS

In Relation to the



Natural Account

OF

LANGUAGES

The Third Edition.

BY

PHILIPPS CANTABRIGIENSIS

L O N D O N :

Printed for S. Birt, at the Bible and Ball
in New-Market, M. DCC. LIII.

P R E F A C E.

THE following Pages being drawn up occasionally, in Opposition to a few general Paragraphs only in a small Pamphlet, the Author did not think himself concern'd to enter farther into the Subject of Languages for that Time, than the present Occasion might seem to require; and for that Reason contented himself with correcting the defective and fallacious Accounts, which had been given of the Sentiments of the Learned upon the Point, and with dropping a few short Hints upon the main Question, as Principles or the Ground-work to a larger Treatise, if any deeper Prosecution of the Point had been render'd necessary.

But no Reply being offer'd to this Tract on the other Side, tho' strongly and often urg'd to it by several ingenious Writers, the little Piece was left to the Reader in its first Draught without any subsequent Illustration or Enlargement. And 'tis presumed, from the favourable Reception it has met with already, that though the Sentiments it espouses on the ancient Diversity of Tongues, are not here re-
pre-

presented in their full Strength, and with the utmost Accuracy, nor defended particularly against some Exceptions and Authorities; yet even in their present Form they appear not destitute of Weight and Use, and will, I hope, be deem'd very capable of greater Lights and Supports, inasmuch as the most celebrated Names in the Republick of Letters, such as Scaliger and Bochart, have not scrupled to patronize the same Hypothesis.

In the mean Time the Reader is desired to observe one farther Circumstance of these Remarks, that they were written when the Letter to Dr. W. was generally attributed to a Person many Degrees inferior in Abilities and Character to the real Author of it, and when the latter was not so much as suspected by the Remarker of such a Design. To this Mistake was owing in a great Measure the Tartness of the following Expostulations, so expressive of Disdain and Indignation in the Author; which, how suitable soever towards the Adversary first supposed, would on several Accounts have been mollified considerably with regard to the other, if known at that Time, notwithstanding any Provocations from his memorable Abuses of Divines.

T O

The AUTHOR.

S I R,

IN a late Letter of yours to the Reverend and learned Dr. *Waterland* I meet with the following Passage pag. 38, 39. *As to the Story itself* (i. e. of Babel, and the confusion of Languages) *one must needs own it to be a strange one* — 'Tis certain it has never made any great impression on Men of Letters, *however pious otherwise and religious: who in tracing the origin and antiquity of the several Languages, seldom think it necessary to run back to Babel, but find the cause to be grounded in Reason and Nature; in the necessary mutability of human things; the rise and fall of States and Empires; change of Modes and Customs; which necessarily introduce a proportionable change in Language. 'Tis from these principles, that Men of Learning have in fact demonstrated the Causes, and deduc'd the History of most particular Languages from their source and origin; not only of those which now obtain, but of such also, as tho' once flourishing are*

A now

now no longer in common use and practice: as the Greek, Latin, Italian, French &c.

MANY *both of the Antients and Moderns have endeavour'd to prove, that the Hebrew was the first and common Language of all, till in process of time, thro' the influence of the causes above hinted, all other Languages sprang out of it, as naturally, as many Shoots from the same Root, many Branches from the same Stock.*

THESE words, as they lie in the form of a general Hypothesis, I chuse to be the subject of a few Pages, without interposing in the particular Argument and Dispute between you and your Adversary, or presuming to appear professedly in Defence of a Person, who, I doubt not, will prove himself perfectly qualified to vindicate the Honour and Authority of Scripture, as well as his own Reputation.

WHEN I first read the Passage above cited in your Letter, I could not but discern immediately the artful design and view of it, *1st.* To give us a hint of your own great advancement and depth in Literature; *2dly,* To cast a tacit and distant Reflection on Divines, for their supposed simplicity, and unacquaintance with the *Nature and Original of Languages.* *3dly.* To suggest and insinuate, that *all Men of Letters* and understanding, who have trac'd the *Origin and Antiquity of Lan-*

Languages, have shewn no regard to the Scripture-History of the Babel-confusion, but proceeded wholly upon *Reason* and *Nature* in their Critical Enquiries and Deductions about them.

THIS last Article being express'd with an extraordinary air of assurance, and in terms very full, bold, and didactical, is to me, I confess, matter of surprize and amazement; tho' not of much trouble and uneasiness. I have made it often the business and diversion of some Hours to search a little into the *Origin* and *Antiquity of Languages*, and have accordingly consulted, as far as I have been able, the Criticks of best note and character upon that subject; but I really do not observe, that the Scripture-Story of Babel *made never any great impression on Men of Letters*, but quite the reverse, as shall be shewn by and by. Strange this! that you and I should see, think, and conclude so differently upon the same Men and Things! But to tell you the truth, I am fully persuaded, that you have not examin'd so far into these matters, as the nature of the thing and such positive assertions might require: and I flatter myself with hopes of proving it clearly to you, and your Readers, before I have done. You have evidently touch'd but slightly on the learned discoveries of modern Criticks, and, not considering with a proper

A 2

attention

attention either the end or use of them, have unhappily fallen into such a mistake, as would mortify a Scholar to be published by any one, much more by himself.

You tell me that *this Story* of Babel has never made any great impresson on *Men of Letters* who have *trac'd the Origin and Antiquity of Languages*. This I must affirm to have not the least Ground, *Reason*, or *Colour of Reason*. Fact and Experience are as strong against you, as they can be against any Paradox or *Hallucination* whatever. Many Writers have collected with great care and curiosity the opinions and judgments of the Learned on the Babel-confusion of Tongues: the chief of which are *Buxtorf*(a), *Pererius*(b), *Duret*(c), Bp. *Walton*(d), and *Morin*(e): not one of all these mention any single Christian Author that ever disputed the Authority of the Sacred Text, but only recount the many and different Interpretations of it. This is evidence alone beyond all exception, that *Men of Letters* who had *trac'd the Origin of Languages*, had receiv'd no small *impresson* from the Scripture Story of *Babel*. But perhaps you would wish to hear more express and particular Declara-

(a) Buxtorfius Fil. Dissertat. Philolog 2. (b) Pererius Lib. 16. in Genesin. (c) L'Histoire des Langues, Cap. 2, 3. (d) Walton. Proleg. in Polyglot. 1. (e) Stephanus Morin. Exercit. de Ling. Prim. ejusque Appendic. Part. 1. Cap. 8.

tions against you. Take this from *Buxtorf*. (f) *Philosophers and some others, unacquainted with History and Scripture, have attributed this variety (of Languages) to Nature. — Divines, following the Authority of Moses, refer the Origin of the multitude of Languages to God, and make him the Author of it: For thus he (Moses) writes of this matter Genes. 11. v. 6, 7, 8, 9. The Lord said &c. And in this most are agreed. But as to the manner and form of the Confusion how it was effected they are divided in their opinions.*

So *Bp. Walton*, another judicious Critick in this part of Learning. (g) *I must now in*

(f) *Philosophi & alii nonnulli, Historiæ & rerum Sacrarum imperiti, Naturæ hanc varietatem adscripsere. — Theologi, Auctoritatem Moſis ſecuti, ad Deum optimum Max. multitudinis linguarum originem referunt, Illumque ejus Authorem faciunt. Sic enim ille hæc de re ſcribit Genes. 11. v. 6, 7, 8, 9. Dixit Dominus &c. Quibus verbis diſertè Deo hujus rei cauſa adſcribitur. Et in hoc quidem conſentiunt & conveniunt plerique. Attamen in modo efficiendi, & formâ hujus confuſionis deſcribendâ, variant ſententiis.*

(g) *Proleg. 1. §. 7. Confuſio linguarum quo Authore, & quomodo facta ſit, proximo loco inquirendum. Ab ipſis hominibus fuiſſe nemo facilè crediderit. — Solus Creator qui unitatem linguæ primus dedit, eam mutare & tollere poteſt. — Reſtat itaque Confuſionem a ſolo Deo inductam fuiſſe. Sic enim diſertè docet textus. Gen. 11. 9. Dominus confudit labia eorum: cumque ſubitò & quaſi momento facta ſit hæc unius linguæ in plures diviſio, & varietas tanta in animis hominum introducta ſit, proficiſci aliunde non poterat — quàm ab eo cui velle & facere idem eſt: quique donum linguarum (miraculorum omnium ferè maximum) hominibus etiam indoctis immediatè contulit, hæc mutationem Babylo- nicam virtute planè divinâ effecit.*

the

the next place enquire by whom and in what manner the confusion of Tongues happen'd. That it was owing to any human means no body would easily be persuaded. The Creator alone, who at first gave the unity of Language, can change and destroy it. It remains therefore that the Confusion was introduced by God alone. For thus the Text expressly teaches us Gen. 11. 9. The Lord confounded their Language. And as this division of one Language into many was effected on a sudden and as it were instantaneously, and so great a variety infused into the minds of Men, it could not proceed from any other cause, but Him with whom to will and to do are the same; and He that conferred, by immediate inspiration, upon Men even unlearned and illiterate the gift of Tongues, the greatest almost of all Miracles, (He it was that) effected the (extraordinary) change at Babel by a Power evidently Divine.

BEFORE him the great Bochart had express'd the same thing (b). *The Confusion of Tongues God alone introduc'd. — The same Babylon, where other Languages had their Birth, was always fatal to the Hebrew, once in the Confusion of Tongues, and a second*

(b) *Geograph. Sacr. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. Confusionem Linguarum solus invexit Deus. — Eadem Babylon, ubi cæteræ linguæ natæ sunt, semper Hebraicæ fuit fatalis, semel in confusione linguarum, & rursus cum Judæi ibi captivi patrium sermonem dedidicerunt.*

time when the Jews in their Captivity there, forgot the Language of their own Country.

Gerard Vossius likewise. (i) We learn from the Divine Moses, that upon the division of the World, which was made in the Days of Heber, after the Confusion of Languages, the East fell to the Portion of Shem's Posterity; &c. He has intimated the same in another part of his Works (k).

Joseph Scaliger indeed has but hinted as much in his 242d Epistle, to Richard Thompson, as also his Father Julius Cæsar Scaliger (l); but however I am very sure you will find it exceeding difficult to prove that either of them ever express'd any doubt concerning the Text in dispute.

To these I have added in the Margin Du-

(i) *Pref. ad Lib. de Vit. Serm.* Ex divino Mose cognoscimus, in divisione mundi, quæ post confusionem Linguarum temporibus Heberi facta est, Orientem obvenisse posteris Semi, Meridiem iis, qui à Chamo descendissent; Septentrionem & Occidentem generi Japheti.

(k) *De Grammatica Lib. 1. cap. 9.* scribit (*Simplicius Comment. 46. in Aristotel. 2. de cælo*) Callisthenem Aristotelis rogatu misisse in Græciam observationes Chaldæorum ab annis 1903 ante tempora Alexandri. Id fuerit annis circiter ducentis ante natum Abrahamum, paulo ante structuram turris Babylonice. Nempe nihil prohibet, quo minus in terrâ Sennaar literis & Astrologiæ vacarent, priusquam de turri eâ cogitaretur, vel locus is Babelis nomen accepisset.

(l) *Exercitat. adv. Cardanum p. 259.* Puer ego ab Hebræis accepi tot (*sexaginta sc. & duas*) esse linguarum differentias, in quas vox, unius antea modi, ad mirificam illam turrim facta esset *μυρίων ἀνθρώπων.* &c.

ret¹, Daniel Heinsius², Selden³, Huetius⁴,

¹ *Thresor des Lang.* Cap. 3. Le grande & admirable Prophete Moÿse après avoir descrit en son histoire du *Genese* ch. 10. fort particulièrement les generations des enfans de Noé & la division des Isles, des Nations, par leurs regions un chacun en sa langue, selon leurs enfans & familles entre leurs gens, escrit au ch. 11. ensuivant ce que s'ensuit. Alors toute la terre universelle estoit d'un mesme langage & parole, & advint comme ils se departirent d'Orient qu'ils trouverent une campagne en la terre de Sennaar, & y habiterent, & dirent l'un à l'autre, or çà faisons des bricques & les cuisons au feu. Si eurent des briques au lieu de pierres, & de l'argile au lieu de ciment, puis dirent edifions nous une tour, de laquelle le Sommet soit jusques au Ciel, faisons que nous ayons renommée, afin que peradvanture ne soyons dispersez sur toute la terre; adonc le Seigneur descendit pour voir la dite tour qu'edifioient les fils des hommes. *And a little lower.* Les Hebreux escrivent que le mot Babel est derivé de la racine בבל Balal qui signifie confondre & brouiller, le quel mot fut donné & imposé à la tour bastie par Nembrod, appelée par les septente deux interpretes Grecs en leur version Grecque σύνυσις confusion à cause qu'en icelle le Seigneur Dieu confondit la premiere langue du Monde, ainsi qu'il est confirme en l'Ecriture Sainte *Gen. 11.*

² *Prolegom. ad Aristarchum* Sac. p. 676. Ut Linguae olim ad discordiam poenamque caelitibus invecata, postea a S Spiritu in usum veritatis ac concordiae sanctificatae sunt, ita post hanc vitam ea commendabitur prae reliquis quae Creatorem suum optimè laudabit. Quia ibi neque *Babel* erit, propter unanimi-tatem, neque multis variisque opus erit linguis, quia unus erit populus unusque omnium ac idem Deus.

³ *Prolegom. ad Deos Syr.* Cap. 2. Babyloniorum, Assyriorum, & Aramæorum primò Ebræum Sermonem fuisse palam est ex eo, quod ante *Linguarum Divisionem*, eorum regiones incolerent, qui unius, ut *Scriptura* ait, labii erant.

⁴ *Demonst. Evangel. Propos. 6.* Cap. 13. Probabilior hæc est sententia, & Doctorum Hominum ac sanctorum etiam Patrum aliquot consensu receptissima, linguam Hebraicam mundo ipsi coævam esse, & Adami, priorumque Patriarcharum usu concelebratam, post *Babelicam linguarum divisionem*, in Semi ac deinde Eberi familiâ integram ad Abrahamum usque, & Israeliticam gentem perseverasse.

Vitringa,

Vitringa (q), *Perizonius* (r), *Morin* (s), and *Dr. Wooton* (t), all concurring in the same Sentiments, all *Men of Letters and tracers of Languages*.

I WILL cite but one Writer more on this point, and that is *Augustin Calmet*, the very Person you refer to in your Margin. I have not indeed seen as yet the particular Piece which you quote of him, but, unless the Learned Benedictine can be guilty of gross inconsistency, I may venture to vouch him in favour of my self, and opposition to you. In his *Scripture Dictionary*, under the word *Babel*, he speaks thus. *Babel, ou Babylone. Ce Terme signifie confusion; Et on donna ce*

(q) *Observat. Sac. Lib. 1. & passim.*

(r) *Origin. Babylon. Cap. 8.* Moses — hæc *Historia Sacra* lacinia non tam id egit, ut exponeret *Babelis* Originem, quam ut traderet *Rationem & Causam*, per quam *Noachidæ*, quum fuissent antea ut necessum erat conjuncti *Lingua*, habitatione, & unius *Populi* Formâ, separati ab se invicem & dispersi in diversa terrarum abierint, atque ita evaserint dein etiam *Lingua* & *Societatis* jure discreti. — Verum hæc ipsa lacinia, quæ cæteroquæ sic satis liquida videtur, absque unâ & alterâ foret difficultate, de quibus ex professo agemus, variis tamen *interpretationibus*, in contraria sæpe discedentibus, & complures rei gestæ circumstantias quas *Scriptura S.* ignorat, nec desiderat sed respuit, commiscentibus, non parum insuper obscuratur. Vid. et. *Cap. 9. & 13.*

(s) *Exercitat. de Ling. Cap. 8.* Receptam ab antiquis & recentioribus auctoribus de *Linguarum multiplicatione in Campis Babylonicis* amplectimur, atque existimamus ex propriis sacri Codicis verbis evidentè fluere, *Labium sive sermonem unum Et eadem* verba adhuc obtinuisse in toto terrarum Orbe, cum turris *Babylonica* insanum opus aggressi sunt *Homines*, ut patet *Genes. 11. 1.*

(t) *Discourse concerning the Confusion of Languages.*

nom à la ville & à la province de Babylone, par ce qu'à la construction de la tour de Babel, Dieu confondit la langue des hommes qui travailloient à cet edifice; en sorte qu'ils ne pouvoient plus s'entendre. On débite diverses conjectures sur la maniere dont s'est fait la confusion des langages à Babel, qui ne sont point de nôtre sujet. — L'Ecriture dit simplement que les Hommes étant partis de l'Orient, & étant venus dans la terre de Sennaar, se dirent les uns aux autres : Faisons nous une ville & une tour, dont le sommet s'élève jusqu'au ciel, & rendons nôtre nom célèbre, avant que nous soyons dispersez dans toute la terre. Or le Seigneur voyant qu'ils avoient commencé cet ouvrage, & qu'ils étoient résolus de ne le pas quitter, qu'ils ne l'eussent achevé: descendit & confondit leur langage; en sorte qu'ils furent contraints de se disperser par toute la terre, & d'abandonner leur Entreprise. And under the word *Langue*. Les profanes, qui n'ont pas en connoissance des Livres saints, ni de l'Histoire de la Creation du Monde, se sont imaginez que les hommes ayant été produit au hasard en differens endroits du Monde, & étant sortis de la terre, de même que les autres animaux, étoient d'abord sans langage & sans connoissances; que premièrement la nécessité & ensuite l'utilité leur firent inventer certains sons & certains termes, pour l'expliquer & pour se faire entendre les uns aux autres; que
de

de là se formèrent les Langues, qui sont si différentes entre elles, parce qu'elles ont été inventées séparément, & sans que ceux qui en sont les premiers auteurs, ayent eu aucune liaison, ni aucun commerce les uns avec les autres. Mais la connoissance que nous avons de l'origine de l'homme, ne nous permet pas de douter que Dieu que créa Adam parfait, ne lui ait donné un langage, pour exprimer ses pensées & ses sentimens. — Ses enfans & ses successeurs parlèrent apparemment le même langage jusqu'au deluge, & depuis le déluge, jusqu'à la confusion arrivée à Babel.

WHAT think you now of your *Men of Letters and tracers of Languages*? Do they all seem to refer the variety of them wholly to *Reason and Nature*, to the rise and fall of *States and Empires*, change of *Modes and Customs*, without any sort of *Divine Interposition*? Do they sneer the *Scripture History of Babel*, and the simplicity and ignorance of those who believe it? Or can you produce in defense of your self any abler *Criricks*, of superior *Genius*, *Abilities*, *Industry*, and *Application*? I am very well assur'd, you neither will nor can.

WELL! but, say you, is it not certain, that *Men of Learning* have in fact demonstrated the *Causes*, and deduc'd the *History* of most particular languages from their source and Origin not only of those which now obtain,

B 2

but

but of such also, as tho' once flourishing, are now no longer in common use and practice, as the Greek, Latin, Italian, French &c.

HAVE not many both of the Antients and Moderns endeavour'd to prove, that the Hebrew was the first and common language of all till in process of time, thro' the influence of the Causes above hinted at, all other Languages sprang out of it, as naturally, as many Shoots from the same Root: many Branches from the same Stock?

VERY little truth in all this; and supposing the whole to be true, no impeachment as yet against Moses, no incredibility in the Babel-Confusion.

BUT, have Men of Letters in tracing the Origin and Antiquity of the several Languages thought it necessary to run back to Babel? No truly in those Languages whose Origin they have really traced to any purpose. If they had they must have forfeited all their title to Critique, and deserv'd the ridicule and censure of all Mankind. This may seem to you perhaps nothing less than Mystery and Paradox. But I'll give you a clear and distinct explication of it in the following Pages, and shew you what a wretched mass of Error, and Confusion lies in the Queries abovesaid,

You ask, whether Men of Learning have not deduc'd to a Demonstration most of the particular

particular Languages both *dead* and *living* from their *Source* and *Origin*; This is all Perplexity, Ambiguity, and Artifice. I answer, Many of the Living they have, but most of the Dead they have not, and *few* ever pretended to it, and none have perform'd it to any tolerable Degree of Success and Satisfaction. And I farther assure you, that whatever Discoveries they have made in Language, the *Mosaick* History will not, cannot suffer any real Prejudice from them. To come to Particulars.

You instance first in the *Greek*, as a Language *trac'd* by Men of Learning to its *Source* and *Origin*. Pray, what kind of *Source* and *Origin* do you mean? Its Origin as to *Characters*, or as to *Substance* and *Idiom*? As to the latter, that (being a different Thing from a *Word* or *Phrase*, of which more hereafter) was never so much as attempted or thought of, as far as I ever heard by Men of Learning; and the first (if that be your Meaning) is no Manner of Help to your Side of the Question. This requires some Enlargement and Illustration.

SUPPOSE it therefore at present, to be shewn by great Numbers of Authors (*u*) Ancient

(*u*) Herodotus Lib. 5. Timon. ap. Var. Critias ap. Athen. Lib. 1. Plin. Lib. 7. Cap. 57. Justin. Mart. in Paren. Tacit. Annal. 11. Clem. Alexand. Stromat. Lib. 1. Irenæus adv. Hæres. Lib. 1. Cap. 12. §. 4. Euseb. Præp. Evang. Lib. 10. Cap. 5. Marius Victorinus Grammat. Lib. 1.

ent and (w) Modern, that *Cadmus* introduced Letters first into *Greece* from *Phœnicia*, in Number sixteen, and in the old *Hebrew* or *Phœnician* Character, about the Time that *Othniel* (x) was Judge among the *Jews*, many Years before the *Trojan War*. I allow that four were afterwards added to the first sixteen by *Palamedes*, and four more to those many Ages later by the Poet *Simonides*. But what then? Will you say upon the Strength of this Discovery that the *Greek Language* has been traced up to its *Origin*, not distinguishing between *Letters* and *Language*? Did ever any Man of Learning suppose that the *Nature*, *Idiom*, and *Form* of the *Greek Tongue* took its Rise and Date from the *Greek Letters*? Childish! if this be your Notion. For what do you imagine might be the *Language* in *Greece* before *Cadmus* introduced his *Phœnician* Letters, during the Space of several hundred Years, from *Javan* the Son of *Japhet*, (from whom the *Iawres* (y) or *Iwres* certainly

(w) Scaliger in Euseb. Digress. Ionic. Lit. p. 102. & Epist. 242. ad Richard. Tompsonum. Epist. 362 ad Stephanum Ubertum. Vossius de Grammat. Lib. 1. Cap. 10. Grot. in Not. ad Lib. 1. Ver. Christ. Rel. §. 15. Ezechiel. Spanhem. Præstant & Uf. Numism. Antiq. Lib. 2. Cap. 2. Montfaucon Palæograph. Græc. Lib. 2. Cap. 1. Bochart. de Colon. Phœnic. Lib. 1. Cap. 20. Walton Prolegom. 2. §. 6, 9. Steph. Morinus de Linguis Part 2 Cap. 4. Edm. Chishul. ad Inscript. Sigeam.

(x) Vossius ibid.

(y) Eusebius in Chron. Græc. p. 12. *Iawres* ἱεὺς Ἑλλῶνες & αἱ *Iawres*. Joseph. Antiq. Lib. 1. Cap. 6. Ἀπὸ *Iawres* ἱεὺς & πῦρτες Ἑλλῶνες. Hieron. Tradit. Hebraicæ in Gen. *Javan*. Jones, qui & Græci, unde mare Ionium. Grot. Annot. ad Lib. 1. Ver. Rel. Christ. Bochart. Geogr. Sac. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.

certainly took their Name and Origin) to *Othaniel* Judge among the *Jews*? Undoubtedly Greek, the same in General and Substance with that which was spoke and wrote after *Cadmus's* Letters. Unless you will reply that Language depends upon Letters, and where there are no Letters, there the Human Species must be mute, or at least without any articulate Sounds and Discourse. I'll clear this matter up by an eminent Instance. We learn from *Socrates* (z), *Vossius* (a), *Morin* (b) and others (c), that the *Gothick* Nation, or at least the greatest part of it were without any Letters, till the Year of Christ 370, and then were first taught them by *Ulphilas* or *Gulphilas* a Christian Bishop. Now would any one venture to assert, that because we have trac'd the Origin of the *Gothick* Letters, we have therefore found the Origin of the *Gothick* Language? Certainly not. And hence it is, that learned Men, tho' they have fix'd the Origin of the *Gothick* Letters, are yet so little agreed and satisfied concerning the Origin and Nature of the Language. *Quant à leur langue, il ne s'en trouve point de marques, dont on peust seurement parler.* Duret. p. 863 (d). You may now by this

(z) Lib. 4. Cap. 27. (a) Vossius de Grammat. Lib. 1. Cap. 9. (b) Stephanus Morin. de Linguis. Part. 2. Cap. 2. (c) Versus Vet ap, Pet Crinitum. Mabillon. de Re Diplom. Lib. 1. Cap. 11. Sect. 3. (d) Vid. et. Joseph. Scaliger. de Linguis Europæ. Gesner. Mithridat. p. 47. & Wafer. in Not. p. 109. time

time easily perceive how little Truth, Sence, and Significancy there is in your *Histories, Sources, and Origins* of the *several Languages*, especially at present with regard to the *Greek*. The least acquaintance with Critique and Philology will shew you your error, and the same learned Men whom you usher in with so much Pomp, Triumph, and Solemnity, will upon a diligent and prudent examination immediately correct your misapprehension, and readily disown the mighty Discoveries you compliment them with. But I have still something farther to observe upon the Greek Language.

You tell me, that all Languages whatever, as many *Antients and Moderns* have endeavour'd to prove, did originally spring out of the *Hebrew*, as naturally as many *Shoots from the same Root*. Here again, you take shelter in fallacy, and wrap yourself up in ambiguity. For pray, what sort of Idea would you please to annex to the word *spring*. It is capable of no less than three widely different meanings. 1st. It may signify only, that the *Hebrew* was the first Language that ever appear'd in the World after the Creation. If this is all that you mean, it is a very weak and inconclusive Argument against the *Story of Babel*, because the same Learned Men who attribute that Honour and Prerogative to the *Hebrew Language*, have nevertheless receiv'd with

with all submission and reverence the Scripture History of the Confusion, as you will find in *Buxtorf*, *Bochart*, *Walton*, and *Morin* in the places abovesited. A second meaning of the word *spring* may be, that from the Hebrew, *Letters* were first deriv'd into other Languages, and thus may be stil'd, with a little impropriety the *Mother* of other Languages. In this sence indeed I may allow that the Greek *sprang* from the Hebrew, but without the least disadvantage to my self or gain to you. The 3^d and last meaning of the word may be, that all other Languages *Spring* from the *Hebrew*, as so many Dialects of it, varying and diversified according to Time and other Accidents, but continuing in General and Substance the same with the Mother Tongue. This perhaps may be your real Sense, as carrying seemingly the most Authority against the *Story of Babel*. Now as in the other two meanings, I have before shewn your *Consequence* to be false and illogical, so here in this last, I will prove your Premises and Matter of Fact to be nothing better than Air and Fiction, I am only concern'd at present for the Greek Language; the others I shall venture to touch upon afterwards. You tell me, the *Greek* is originally only a Dialect of the *Hebrew*. I would desire to know, upon what Authority? Experimental Knowledge and attentive Comparison

of them both? Impossible! I should think there is no Similitude in the two Languages, that can give any ground or countenance to such a notion. Every part of Speech throughout the Grammars, from *Noun* to the minutest *Particle*, is a clear and irrefragable Argument against it. Have the *Greeks* any *affixes* or *præfixes*, *præformantes* or *efformantes*, Letters *Radical* and *Servile*, words *Heemantick*, *castrations* of *Vowels* &c. Has the *Hebrew* on the other side any *Cases* and *declensions* in *Nouns*; any *Aorists*, *Futures* 1 and 2, *paulo post Futurums*, such a Variety of *Moods* as the *Greek*? Add to this, that the whole *Turn*, *Idiom*, and *Phraseology* of the *Greek* is totally different from that of the *Hebrew*. The only Resemblance that I can perceive between them, is in the *Alphabet*; but as the Cause of it is known to every Scholar, the Question will not in the least be affected by it. But in Languages that are really and truly nothing but *Dialects* of the *Hebrew*, the Case is quite otherwise. *Syriack* and *Chaldee* bear a Similitude to the *Hebrew*, in almost every particular of *Grammar* and *Phraseology* (a); and from hence it was that *Lucas Burgenfis* pronounc'd them so easy to be learnt (b) after the *Hebrew*. You will answer perhaps, that many *Hebrew* words ap-

(a) Vid. *Buxtorf. Grammat. Chald. & Syriac.* Ludovicus de Dieu *Grammat. Ling. Oriental.*

(b) Ap. *Walton. Proleg. 12. Sect. 2.*

pear in the *Greek* Language with a small variation. I grant it, and could shew it in a great number of Instances. But you cannot conclude with any justness from thence, that *Greek* is only a *Dialect* of *Hebrew*. The *Teutonic* has deriv'd abundance of Words from the *Persian* Tongue, and the *Spanish* from the *Arabick*(c), will you therefore call the *Teutonic* a *Dialect* of the *Persian*, or the *Spanish* of *Arabick*? The *English* Tongue has borrow'd multitudes of Expressions from the *French*, must the *English* Tongue therefore be stil'd a *Dialect* only of the *French*? Thus far I have trac'd and disprov'd your Assertion of the *Greek* Language, from the Reason and Nature of Things. I will now produce the current Opinions of Learned Men against you. *Joseph Scaliger* (d) says, that the *Greek*, *Latin*, *Teutonic*, and *Slavonick* are to be look'd upon as four *Matrices*, or Mother Languages, out of which, as from one common Parent, many *Dialects* or *Branches* have deriv'd and spread themselves. And he farther defines those to be properly *Matrices*, that have no Relation or Affinity between them. Here you see the great *Phœnix*

(c) *Joseph. Scal. Epist. 228. ad Isaac. Pontanum.*

(d) *De Linguis Europæ. Sunt — quatuor hæc Verba Dæus, Θεός, Godt, Boge, notæ quatuor — Matricum, Latinæ, Græcæ, Teutonicæ, Slavonicæ. — Linguis Matricēs vocare possumus, ex quibus multa Dialecti, tanquam propagines deductæ sunt. Propagines quidem unius matricis lingua commercia inter se aliquo conjunctæ sunt: Matricum vero inter se nulla cognatio est.*

of his Age, who had trac'd the Languages with as much Learning, Skill, and Judgment as any Man, gives the Title of *Matrix* to no less than three Languages besides the *Greek*, whereas you would persuade us that the *Hebrew* alone has any claim or pretension to it. Bp. *Walton* (e) tells us, that among the several Languages known to us, some are called by the Learned Cardinal ones, from which many others have sprung, and multiplied, as 1st The *Hebrew*, 2^d The *Greek*, &c. I could add a third excellent Critick (f), but these two Persons, I believe, may satisfy you and every Reader with respect to the generality of the Men of Letters, that it was never their Opinion, that the *Greek* Language

(e) *Prolegom.* 1. *Seet.* 14. Quædam inter linguas nobis cognititas quasi *Cardinales*, e quibus multæ aliæ pullulârunt, à *Doctis recensentur.* 1. *Hebræa* unde *Chaldaica*, sive *Syriaca*, *Chanaanitica*, *Punica*, *Arabica*, — *Armena*, *Æthiopica*, & ex parte *Persica*. 2. *Græca*, cum variis ejus *Dialectis*, tam quinque vulgò notis, quam aliis plurimis; quæ per diversas *Urbes* gentesque *Græciæ* finitimas & per *Variâs*, ubi *Græcorum* Imperium vigeat, nationes extensa, cum aliis mixta novas linguas produxit.

(f) *Daniel Heinsius. Prolegom. ad Exercit. sac. p. 30.* Adde quod nec *Idioma* *Orientis*, ad verbum cum exprimitur, satis ipsi vel utique affecti sint, vel utique, ut oportet, expresserint *Græci*. Cum vix dici possit, quam hæc, sive *Dialectus* sive *Lingua*, a *Græcismo* longè abeat nonnunquam: quamquam casu seu κατὰ συντυχίαν, ut alibi docuimus, cum *Hebraismo* ut & *Syriasmo* *Græca* quoque *Phrasis* convenire possit: quod in omnibus fit *Linguis*. Ut omnino nihil dicant, qui malignè potius quam verè hæc de re pronunciârunt. Cum & de *Græcismo* omnibusque autoribus antiquis *Græcis*, tum & istis qui ab illis quàm longissimè recedunt, rectum requiratur hîc judicium.

sprang

sprang from the *Hebrew* as a *branch* from a *Root*; Some, I know there have been, who have freely indulg'd themselves in that way of thinking (g), but with too precipitate a fondness for a singular Notion, having no other argument, proof, or Discovery for it but this, that the *Greek* Tongue in a long course of Ages, had adopted many words and expressions from the *Hebrew*. But this is Evidence far from being clear, cogent, and convincing; and after what has been said, I shall venture to declare, that for ought any thing You or I or the *Men of Letters* know to the Contrary, the *Greek* Language may be one of those many that arose from the *Babel-Confusion*.

I NOW pass on to consider the *Latin* and other Languages.

THE *Latin* Tongue you give as a second instance of *Languages trac'd* to their *Source* and *Origin* by *Men of Learning*. Still in the dark, confus'd, and unintelligible! *Latin* as it stands in your Letter, without any Definition or Explication, is a word wholly æquivocal and illusive. One would think by your way of Expression, that there could only be one Sense affix'd to it, whereas it is really and certainly capable of four, and upon the clear Distinction of the several Senses,

(g) Ap. *Walton*. Prolegom. 1. Sect. 10. *Vitringam*. Observat. sac. cap. 6.

depends the Truth of your Assertion, and the Justness of the Argument. You must know, the *Latin Language* is nicely distinguish'd by Criticks into four Sorts, the *Prisca*, the *Latina*, *Romana*, and *Mixta* (b). The

(b) *Gesner. in Mithridat. p. 65. Ed. 2da. ex Pet. Crinit.* Relatum est quatuor fuisse apud nostros (i. e. Romanos) linguarum proprietates, hoc est, *Priscam, Latinam, Romanam, Mixtam*, quod ex *Varronis* Authoritate Grammatici Veteres tradunt. *Prisca* est, quâ vetustissimi Italiæ populi sub Jano videlicet & Saturno regibus usi sunt: cujusmodi carmina quædam inædita, parumque nostris intellecta adhuc supersunt: ut *Saliorum & Argeorum sacra*, de quibus Varro etiam Terentius meminit. *Latina* verò, quam sub Latino & Regibus Tusciæ cæteri quidem Populi in ipso Latio loquebantur: quâ tabulæ Decemvires scriptæ sunt, ac sacræ Leges, & publica quædam edicta. *Romana*, quæ post exactos Reges Romanos populi Gesta complexa est. Nam & hanc ipsam inter Poetas M. Plautus, Nævius, Accius, Pacuvius, Ennius & P. Virgilius maximè coluerunt. Ex oratoribus autem & Historicis M. Cato, Sisenæ, Quadrigarius, Val. Antias, Cæsar, & M. Cicero. *Mixta* vero, quæ aucto Imperio & Libertate amissâ, varios populos ac Nationes in jura Civitatis admisit, quo factum est, ut Romana virtus ac loquendi juxta integritas passim cum moribus degeneraret. *Gerard Vossius Præf. ad Lib. de Vitiis Sermôn.* Habuit Sermo *Latinus* ætatem crescentem, habuit decrecentem, habuit inter utramque vigorem suum. Crescentem divido in Pueritiam, & adolescentiam. Ad priorem refero *Saliares Numæ Pompilii*, ac similes hymnos, quos ævo optimo vix Sacerdotes sui intelligebant; item leges Regias ac Decemvires; necnon Pontificum Leges & Annales; ad hæc columnam *Rostratam Duillii*, aliaque his similia. Adolescentiam auspicamur à *Livio Andronico*; quem secuti inter alios Nævius, Ennius, Pacuvius, Attius: meliorque his *Portius Cato*, cujus Libri de *R. Rusticâ* perdurârunt: cæterorum fragmenta solum habemus. Optimi verò in Adolescentia hæc Plautus, Terentiusque, Vigorem verò ac maturitatem in prosâ habent Cicero, Cæsar, &c. in Carmine Lucretius, Catullus, Maro &c. — Posteaquam verò Roma prius sub Odoacro, mox sub Gothis fuit: ac à variis Gentibus, quas Romani barbaras vocârunt, miserè discerptum est Imperium; Sermônem Romanum, non jam quasi decrepitum,

Prisca is that sort of *Latin* which was antiently in Use among the first Inhabitants of *Italy* in the Days of *Janus* and *Saturn*, before any Colonies from *Greece* had settlement there, and is call'd by *Gerard Vossius*, *Primo-genia*, or the *Primitive Language of Latium*. The *Latina*, was a *Latin* of something later Date, the Language of King *Latinus*, and the People of his Time, in which were compos'd perhaps the famous 12 Tables, the Laws and Annals of the High Priests, and some Publick Edicts, corrupted a little from the Primitive, by Greek intermixtures and adulterations. The *Romana* was that which was introduc'd first in the Writings of *Nævius*, *Ennius*, *Pacuvius*, *Attius*, and *Cato*, cultivated afterwards with great Improvements by *Plautus*, *Terence*, &c. and brought at last to the highest Perfection of Purity and Elegance, by *Lucretius*, *Catullus*, *Virgil*, *Cicero*, *Cæsar*, *Sallust*, *Livy*, &c. The *Mixta*, the 4th sort of *Latin*, was that which arose after the great

crepitum, sed dixero moribundum vel potius emortuum, magisque cadaveri quam vivo similem corpori. *Cangius Illustriss.* in *Præf. ad Glossar. Lat.* Sect. 2. *Latinas Linguas quatuor quidam esse dixerunt, Priscam, Latinam, Romanam, Mixtam. Priscam*, quâ vetustissimi *Italiæ* Populi sub *Jano* & *Saturno* sunt usi, incondita ut se habent carmina *Saliorum*. *Latinam* deinde, quam sub *Latino* & *Regibus Tusciæ* cæteri in *Latio* sunt locuti. *Romanam*, quæ post exactos Reges in *Populo Romano* vixit. — *Mixtam* denique, quæ post Imperium latius promotum simul cum moribus & hominibus in *Romanam Civitatem* irrepsit, integritatemque verbi per *Solæcismos* & *Barbarismos* corruptit. *Vid. et. Duret. 770, & seq.*

decline

decline and decay both of the *Roman* Empire and Language, made up of numberless Barbarisms and Solecisms from many Nations and Languages, and preserving but little Remains of that which is stil'd *Classick Latin*. Now take the Latin Language in either of the last three Senses, I will readily allow that it has been trac'd to its Origin. But what does it prove? Just nothing at all against the *Story of Babel*. Because tho' *Latin* according to the three last Denominations and Kinds, may admit of a certain Date, and Historical *Deduction* from *Men of Letters*, yet the first fort, the Antient and Primitive Language of *Italy* and the Parts adjacent, stands still unoriginated without any particular *Æra*, *Cause*, and Account fix'd to it. This is imported in the very name of it *Prisca*, signifying only in general its superior Antiquity to the others, without any particular Mark, Description and Character of it; and therefore notwithstanding what some have objected (i) concerning the *Latin* i. e. the *Romana*, or *Latina* being only a derivative and dialect of the *Greek*, the *Prisca* may ultimately be refer'd to the *Babel-Confusion*, without any Impossibility, Anacronism or Charge of ἀντογενεία.

HAVING hitherto shewn how exceeding raw and unexperienc'd you are in the affair of Languages, and how little qualify'd to ar-

(i) *Vitring. Observat. sac. Lib. I. Cap. 7. Sect. 23.*

gue and determine upon them, I shall now endeavour to give you some farther Knowledge and Insight into those Matters, by setting the Discoveries of Learned Linguists, in their true and proper Light from short Extracts out of their own Writings.

I WILL therefore in the Sequel consider what Languages *have been trac'd* to their Origin, what have not, and how far the *Mosaick* History is affected by such Deductions.

IT is then very carefully to be observ'd, that whatever Languages, (except the *Hebrew*) have been really trac'd to any natural Source and Origin by Men of Learning, are such as are properly Modern, and grown into Use in the latter Ages only of the World, and substituted in the Room of others more Antient and pure. To begin with the Language of our own Country *England*. We learn from many Writers(k), that the *English* Language was first introduc'd by the *Saxons* being one Dialect of the *Teutonick*(l), and afterwards adulterated by another Dialect of it, the *Danish* and *Norman*. Be it therefore allow'd that the *English* Language is *trac'd* to its Origin, and easily accounted for from *Reason*, *Mutability of Human Things*, *Rise and Fall of States and Kingdoms*. But what will you

(k) *Gesner. Mithrid. p. 9. & 13. Scaliger. de Ling. Europ. Duret. p. 873.*

(l) *Matricis Godt (Tentonica) propagines five idiomata precipua sunt tria, Teutonismus, Saxonismus & Danismus. Scal. ib.*

do with the Original and Primitive Language of *Britain*? Where will you fix its Birth and Source from the time the Isle was Inhabited, to the *Saxon* Conquest. Here the Criticks and the *Men of Learning* are wholly at a stand. They tell us indeed, that the *British* Language was the same with the *Tartaric* (m), but the *Tartaric* it self they do not trace to its Fountain: And *Gerard Vossius* seems to think that the *British* as well as the old *Gallic*, *Spanish*, and *German* Tongues sprang originally from *Japhet's* eldest Son *Gomer* and his Posterity (n). The same thing may be seen and exemplifi'd in other Languages. The *French*, *Italian*, and *Spanish* Tongues, are very well known to be nothing more than Corruptions and Mixtures of *Latin*, *Francic*, and *Celtic* (o). And these it is true are easily trac'd up to their *Source* and *Origin*. But as they were very late in Existence, and did but succeed to Languages of higher Antiquity, those that preceded, lie still out of Reach and Knowledge, and can-

(m) Walton *Prolegom.* 1. §. 14.

(n) Europææ autem Scythiæ terras, Tanai trajecto, occupant Cimmerii; ——— A Gomero illos filiorum (Japheti) natu maximo, ab illis verò Cimbros genus ducere, vulgatio opinio est. Ex hisce locis quæ diximus paulatim sunt profecti in terras alias atque alias Communis verò lingua fuit Scythis & Celtis; hoc est, Germanis, & veteribus Gallis, Hispanis, Britannis. Sed hi postea multum à primogeniâ recesserunt. *Præf. ad Lib. de Vit. Serm.*

(o) Matrix Deus (Latina) peperit Italicam. Gallicam & Hispanicam. *Scalig. Ling. Europ. Gefner. Mithrid.* p. 25, 49, 57.
not

not be trac'd to their Fountain any more than the Head of *Nile*. Thus it is also in the several Branches and Derivatives of other Primary and Antient Languages. Whatever out of these have been with any clearness and certainty trac'd up to their *Origin* (the Number of which comparatively is exceeding small) may justly be esteem'd as of Yesterday, owing their Rise to a Series of Ages, and Varieties of Accidents; whereas the Original and Primitive Tongues, have buried their Nativity in a numerous Train of After-Generations, and are prior perhaps not only to History, but Letters themselves. It would be tedious and endless to transcribe in this place from *Gesner*, *Scaliger*, *Bochart*, *Walton*, and others, a particular and accurate account of every single Language. I shall think it sufficient to touch at present upon Generals only, and give you in a few Hints subject for any nicer Examination. Let us therefore suppose it to be shewn at large, by Men of Learning, that the several Languages of *Dalmatia*, *Muscovy*, the *Vandali*, *Croati*, of *Bohemia*, *Polonia*, *Lithuania* and fifty others reckon'd up by *Gesner*, are all Species with some Corruption of the *Sclavonic* (p).

(p) *Sclavonica* sive *Illyrica*, longè per *Europam* & *Asiam* se extendens, sub quâ *Dalmatica*, *Muscovitica*, *Vandalica*, *Croatica*, *Bohemica*, *Polonica*, *Lithuanica*, aliæque ejus quasi *Dialecti*. *Walton*. *Proleg.* 1. §. 14. Hæc *Matrix* sive *Lingua* *Bogæ* (i. e. *Sclavonica*) in multas propagines diffusa est, *Rutenicam*, *Polonicam*, *Boëmicam*, *Illyricam*, *Dalmaticam*, *Windicam* & alias

Let us again suppose that the present Languages of *Germany, Helvetia, Suevia, Westphalia, Austria, Belgia, Wales, Denmark, Sueden, Norway*, and others have been all shewn to be several species of *Teutonick* (q). Let us farther suppose the Languages of the most Nothern Nations to be several adulterated branches of the *Tartaric* or *Scythian* (r). To pass from *Europe* into *Asia* and *Africa*. Let us take it for granted, that the modern *Ægyptian* is prov'd to be a Dialect made up of *Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Arabick* and *Æthiopic* (s); that the vulgar *Æthiopic* was first

alias quas unusquisque potest adjicere. *Joseph. Scal. Ling. Europ.* Enumeratio alphabetica populorum qui *Illyricâ* (i. e. *Sclavonicâ*) linguâ utuntur. *Abgazari* vel *Abgazelli* qui & *Gazari* circa mare *Caspium*, *Æstui*, *Arbenses*, *Bessi*, hodiè *Bosnenses* vel *Bosnajienses*, *Bohemi*, *Borussii*, *Bulgari*, *Carni*, *Carniolani*, &c. *Gesner in Mithrid.* p. 60. Quis nescit natam esse ex *Sclavonicâ*, *Polonicam*, *Hungaricam*, *Bohemicam*, *Dalmaticam*, *Croaticam* &c. *Bochar. Geogr. Sacr. Lib. 1. Cap. 15.*

(q) *Teutonica* five *Germanica*, unde *Germanica* communis, *Helvetica Teutonica* priscae proxima, *Suevica*, *Westphalica*, *Austriaca*, *Belgica* per *Flandriam*, *Brabantiam*, *Bataviam*, aliasque regiones disseminata, & *Cambrica*, sub quâ *Danicam*, *Suedicam*, *Norwegicam*, *Anglicam*, *Gothicam* numerant. *Walton. Ibid.* Ex *Germanica* (i. e. *Teutonica*) quis nescit natam esse *Belgicam*, *Anglicam*, *Danicam*, *Norwegicam*, &c. *Bochart* *ibid. Scalig. ibid.*

(r) *Tartarica*, quæ longè per septentrionem vagatur, ad quam multæ *Europaorum* & *Asiaticorum* linguæ antiquæ referendæ, si *Boxhornio* credendum, ut antiqua *Gallica* & *Britannica*, cujus reliquæ adhuc in *Walliâ* manent, *Hispanica* antiqua, *Turcica* &c. *Walton. Ibid.*

(s) Quæ lingua (sc. *Ægyptia*) cum sit penitus deleta in *Ægypto* primum per *Græcos*, deinde per *Romanos*, postea per *Saracenos* & *Arabes*, & pauca supersint vocabula in monumentis literarum, non potest facile judicari aut aliquid pro comperto pro-

introduc'd into common use, when the seat of the Kingdom was remov'd from *Axuma*(t); That the Modern *Persic* is little else than a jarring conflux of *Greek, Latin, Arabick, Tartaric* (u) &c. What is the natural and

pronunciari de *Lingua* (sc. *antiqua*) *Ægyptiorum*. *Bibliand.* ap. *Duret.* p. 380. *Bochart.* ubi supra.

(t) Relicta *Axumâ* translatoque in mediterraneum Regni imperio, lingua hæc nostra (*Æthiopica antiqua*) in usu vulgari esse desiit. Etenim familiâ *Zagaa* deficiente, cum alius Rex ex *Senâ*, ubi ferè *Amharicè* loquuntur, peteretur; nonnulli etiam ex *Rupe Ambara* ab exilio in Regnum adsciscerentur, *Ambarica* dialectus in usum venit. Nam novus Rex, linguæ *Tigrænsis* (*Gbeez dicta*) rudis, assumptis familiaribus, qui eodem secum sermone utebantur, vernaculam suam in aulam & castra invexit; quæ diu ibi & in vicinis oris locata, rarè in *Tigram* movebantur. Eum secuti sunt cæteri Proceres atque magnates; ut mos est *Aulicis*, Regis mores imitari ejusque dialecto uti. Sic *Ambarica* lingua — cum aulâ & castris per universum Regnum ceu Regia circumlata, brevi omnibus aliis dialectis, ipsique antiqua & nobili nostra in communi loquendi Usu prevaluit. *Job. Ludolphus Hist. Æthiop. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. Walton. Proleg. 15. §. 6. & seq.*

(u) Sciendum est in *Persicâ* hodiernâ magnam esse mixturam vocabulorum, ex Gentium varietate, quæ in *Persiam* variis temporibus irruerunt, *Græcorum*, sc. *Romanorum, Arabum, Turcarum, Tartarorum* sub *Tamerlane* &c. *Walton. Proleg. 16. §. 2.* Les Perses qui sont pour le jourd'huy en Perse, sont descendus des Parthes, provenus & procedez de la Scythie, ainsi q'assurent les historiens modernes, la langue Persane du jourd'huy a grand cours & vogue par la plus grand partie de l'Asie, & a autant de Credit & Reputation que la langue Latine en a par tout l'Occident, estant icelle langue procédée du mellange & commixtion des langues *Hebraïque, Chaldaïque, Syriaque, Sarrafinesque, Arabesque, Turquesque, Moresque, Tartaresque*, & autres usitées par toute l'Asie. *Duret. de Ling. Cap. 48. p. 497.* *Zerdusht* seu *Zeratusht* scripsit aliquammultos Libros de variis subjectis, omnes *Lingua antiqua* in plerisque locis jam obsoletâ. *Thom. Hyde Pref. ad Religion Vet. Pers.* Præmitto *Persas* distinguendos esse in *Veteres* eorumque *Sobolem* & *feros nepotes*, — & in *moderniores*; quæ *moderniorum* gens ut & eorum *Lingua*, olim ex aliquot aliis confata est, partim

ex

proper Conclusion from all this? That Men of Learning have in fact trac'd to their *Source and Origin* the *several Languages* of the World of *all Times*? That they either have or could possibly account for all the Varieties of them from *Reason and Nature, Mutability of Human affairs, rise and fall of States and Empires*? Impossible, by all the Violence and Torture imaginable! For how is the great Hiatus and Intervall fill'd up between the Rise of the Modern and that of Language it self (*w*)? Or how is it reasonable

ex Alienigenis *Saracenis & Tartaris*, præcipuè vero ex aliquibus *Indigenis Parthis & Medis* & veteribus *Persis* ad *Islemismum* desciscitentibus. *Id. Cap. 1.* Eæ voces quæ apud *Herodotum* & alios de linguâ *Persicâ* seu *Parthicâ* esse dicuntur, reverâ sunt ex *Medicâ*, vel saltem maxima earum pars. Illa ipsa lingua *Medica* est quæ hodiè in *Elymaide & Mediâ & Parthiâ & Chorasân* (exceptis quibusdam locis) jam obtinet, & olim cum *Medico* Imperio ibi plantata fuit. Hæcque *Medorum* Lingua Veterem Linguam *Persicam* reddidit mixtam, & pœne obsoletam effecit. — Lingua *Medica* ex aliis mixta est, sc. ex *Hebræâ, Græcâ, & Teutonicâ* seu *Gothicâ*. — Et haud mirum est si ex *Parthorum* bello cum *Romanis* aliquæ voces *Latina* etiam in Linguâ *Partho-Medicâ* reperiantur, cum etiam *Phraates* 4 suos filios *Roma* educandos misit. *Id. Cap. 35.*

(*w*) Enimvero, quæ de Linguarum plurimarum Origine ab *Hebræâ*, vel aliâ huic vicinâ, & successivo apud Populos præcipuos & præcipuè per Europam celebratos ortu — scribuntur, ea magnâ ex parte quidem pro veris aut verisimilibus haberi possunt: sed & multa consistunt in incertissimis conjecturis aut traditionibus, sed nihil admodum faciunt contra primum ortum *Diversitatis Linguarum in Babel* hinc nominatâ quam *Moses* tradidit, & quæ quousque processerit ab initio primo, nostrum non est determinare. Uti sic ex Linguarum *Europaarum* bodiarnarum ortu à *Latinâ*, & translatione in varias *Asiæ, Africæ, & Americæ* partes jure nemo concluscrit, nullam aliam Linguarum varietatem retrò obtinuisse, quam qua sic per sæculorum

to pronounce one Language a *branch* and *root* of another, when there is no Similitude and Analogy discernable between them? The Learned French Nobleman *Mornæus*, and others will teach you the contrary (y).

lorum lapsum introducta fuit occasione diffusæ Romanæ Potentia. *Markius Exercitat. Philolog. 1. §. 22.*

(y) Ut ratio ad primum aliquem hominem nos deduxit, ita & ad unam aliquam primam linguam nos eadem deducat oportet &c. Et hanc quidem temporis progressu multipliciter immutatam fuisse suspicari quis posset, *si dialecto tantum differrent. Sed multas linguas esse nemo ignorat, quarum radices omnino diversa sunt, & quæ nil prorsus commune habent, nisi paucula forte verba, unà cum peregrinis mercibus commæantia &c.* Superest, ut qui colonias in varias Orbis partes duxerunt, illas consulto excogitarent. At quæ vanitas! & quæ ætas in eam rem sufficiat? Et quid inde commodi aut inventores aut comites sperare possint? Imo quis calamitatem & cladem publicam esse non videat? non scientiam, sed ignorantiam, non voluptatem sibi, sed posteris tormentum? Ergo dicat nobis hic Ratio, *quod Scriptura dicit, ab initio unam solummodo linguam fuisse, & ab hominibus non linguas certè divisas multiplicatasve, sed à linguis Homines.* *Mornæus ap. Joan. Marcium Exercit. Philolog. 1. §. 22.*

Unde tot Linguarum Varietas per Orbem Terrarum, si non Divinâ immiffione? Præadamita nescio unde derivet sermonum diversitatem. Scio illud, nec unam quidem Linguam produci posse conjunctis Sapientum consiliis, nec unquam factam esse. Possunt sibi fingere voces multas diversas ut ne intelligantur; sed linguam totâ ratione suâque plenitudine aliam nulla hominum sapientia genuerit. Hæc quidem natura linguarum est, ut facile habitum mutant. — *Sed aliud est efflorescere alia vocabula, aliud lingua genium universum intercidere.* Linguam posse interire fatemur, sed missionibus gentium & longo sæculorum lapsu, qui tamen *radices* relinquit, etsi comam ramosque & Grammaticam mutet, uti factum in Linguâ *Gallicâ, Italicâ, Hispanicâ*, quæ de radice Latinâ, succisâ illâ primâ Romani veterisque Sermonis Arbore, propullulârunt. Linguam igitur deleri, & penitus novam enasci non eveniat annorum millibus, nisi induxeris peregrinitatem ab alio Sermone. Sic autem opprimitur potius, quam ætatis suæ senio & vitio emoritur.

It was obvious enough not only to great, but common Capacities, that if the Antient and Primitive Languages of *Europe*, *Asia* and *Africa* lay still undiscover'd, without any natural *Source* or *Origin* assign'd them by *Men of Letters*, the Scripture-History could not possibly suffer the least Imputation or Prejudice from tracing the modern Derivatives, Dialects, and Branches, the genuine Offspring of length of Time, and the *Mutability of Human affairs*. And that this is really the Case, we have ample assurance from the tacit and express Confession of Linguists and Criticks. Who is there among them of Note and Character that offers and pretends to trace *with Demonstration* (as you term it) the *Teutonick*, *Tartarick*, *Sclavonick*, *Greek*, (which are called *Matrices* or *Mother-Languages* *x*) to any other Source but that of *Babel*? Who is there, that tells us the Antient and Original Languages of *Ægypt* and *Africa*? Who has ever *deduc'd* the Natural Cause and History of the *Persian* and the *Chinese*? Or what was the Language of *Carthage* before the *Phœnician* was there introduc'd by *Phœnician Colonies*? To say nothing of those mention'd in the *Acts* of the

emoritur. Aded dixeris illas quæ hodie extant sermonum diversitates & differentias esse mixturas & farragines illarum Linguarum quas Babylone Deus hominibus immisit. Schotanus ap. eund. ibid. §. 24. Vid. et. Wooton. Confus. Babel.

(*x*) Walton. Proleg. 1. Joseph. Scalig. Ling. Europ.

Apostles

Apostles Ch. 2. v. 9. & *seq.* From hence you may see one evident Reason why *Men of Letters in tracing the Origin of Languages, have seldom thought it necessary to run back to Babel.* Because the Language whose Origin has really been *trac'd* by Men of Letters, had no Existence till hundreds not to say thousands of Years after the building that Tower. For what a ridiculous Figure would *Gesner* or *Scaliger* or *Bochart* have made in Chronology, and Critique, if they had refer'd the *French, Italian, English* and many other Tongues to the Babel-Confusion! As on the other side, what arrant Triflers and Children in Reason must they have necessarily appear'd, if because they had found some Languages, taking their Rise from natural Causes 4 or 5 hundred Years ago, they had argu'd against any miraculous Variety of Languages at the Distance of 4 or 5 thousand! I am almost weary of explaining a Thing so Clear and Palpable. I will therefore add but one word or two more on this Head, in Relation to the *Hebrew.* You seem to think that because the *Hebrew* has been prov'd by many Antients and Moderns, to have been the first and common Language of Mankind, it has also been prov'd, that all other Languages are to be look'd upon only as so many *natural* Dialects or Branches of it. But this is a great Error; (and I have in part confuted it before)

E

For

For your Inference is not supported either by Antients or Moderns. You quote St. *Jerom* in his Comment on *Sophoniah* for your Opinion, but utterly mistake his meaning. He did not intend to insinuate any doubt of the Babel-Confusion (for that would directly contradict what he says on another occasion *z*) but the Sense of the Passage is only, that as the *Hebrew* is Prior to all other Languages, so many *Hebrew* words have pass'd out of that into other Tongues. And thus He explains himself in his Comment on *Isaiab* (*a*). And thus he is understood, and interpreted by *Pererius* and *Bochart* (*b*). As to the Moderns, it cannot indeed be denied, that many of them have endeavour'd to prove that the *Hebrew* was the first and common Language of all. But I will venture to affirm,

(*z*) *Tradit. Hebraica in Genes. 10. Nemrod, Filius Chus arripuit insuetam primus in populo Tyrannidem, regnavitque in Babylone, quæ ab eo quod ibi confusa sunt Lingua Turrim ædificantium Babel appellata est. Babel enim interpretatur confusio. — Heber, à quo Hebræi, vaticinio quodam filio suo Phaleg nomen imposuit, qui interpretatur, Divisio, ab eo quod in diebus ejus Lingua in Babylone divisa sunt.*

(*a*) Omnium pene Linguarum verbis utuntur Hebræi. *Comm. in Isa. Lib. 3. Cap. 7.*

(*b*) *Pererius in Genes. Lib. 16. Hactenus ex Augustino. Cujus Opinionis summa est, Hebræam Linguam fuisse primam omnium, eaque usum esse omne Genus Hominum ante ædificationem turris Babel. — Eadem est B. Hieronymi sententia, is enim super tertium caput Sophonia, &c. Bochart. Geogr. Sacr. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. Communis illa omnium hominum lingua qualis fuerit, his verbis docet Hierosolymitanus Interpres &c. — Sic Hieronymus in Sophonia Cap. 3. asserit Linguam Hebræicam omnium Linguarum esse Matricem.*

that

that you cannot produce any single Modern of considerable Character and Learning, that ever *endeavour'd to prove*, that in *Process of Time, through the Causes above hinted at*, i. e. purely natural Causes, *all other Languages sprang out of it as naturally as many shoots from the same Root, many branches from the same Stock*. I can easily guess at the Cause of your mistake; You perhaps might have seen some Learned Moderns *deriving* other Languages in some measure from the *Hebrew*; this I know to have been done by several, from *Buxtorf(c)*, Bp. *Walton(d)*, and others. But they did not derive them from the *Hebrew* by *natural Causes*, or in *Process of Time*, excluding all Intervention of the Divinity, for they all believ'd and follow'd the Scripture History, as I have shewn you before. These words of yours therefore are added without any ground or Foundation, and speak at random nothing but Fancy and Fiction. And besides this the most judicious Bp. *Walton*, deservedly Censures them for going so far in this sort of *Derivation* as they did. For the whole ground and strength of their Argument, was the Appearance of many *Hebrew* words in other Languages, whereas the same thing happens in almost all sorts of Languages with regard to one another. There

(c) *Buxtorf. Diff. 2. p. 65.*

(d) *Walton. Proleg. 3. §. 8. Proleg. 1. §. 10.*

being hardly any one Language known, that does not borrow great numbers of Words from others, as well as from the *Hebrew* (e). While I was writing this, I met with Dr. *Wooton's* Dissertation on this very Subject, I read it over with a great deal of Pleasure and with equal satisfaction, to find so curious a Critick agreeing with me in every Article, where we both had touch'd upon the same point. It may possibly be imagin'd that what he relates of Mr. *Le Clerc*, Mr. *Reland*, and some others, is a strong Confirmation of what you had suggested, that the *story of Babel, had not made any great Impression on Men of Letters*. He tells us indeed (f), that *several very good and religious, as well as very Learned and Ingenious Men*, had thought that the

(e) Statuendum est non omnes Linguas ex Hebraicâ ortas esse ita ut reliquæ ejus tantum sint Dialecti, prout *multi* opinantur, qui omnes Linguas ad *Hebraicas* Origines revocare student. Est quidem *Hebraea* omnium antiquissima; ejusque *Reliquiæ* quædam in omnibus fere Linguis reperiuntur; quædam etiam Linguæ magnam cum *Hebræâ* affinitatem habent, præsertim quæ *Babyloni* viciniore, ut de *Chaldaicâ*, *Arabicâ*, *Syriacâ*, *Æthiopicâ* & aliis videmus, unde ejus Filix & dialecti improprie dici possunt; proprie tamen & strictè loquendo, linguæ sunt diversæ, quarum qui unam callet, alteram fortè non intelligit. — *Multa* sanè *Verba* sunt in *diversis* *Linguis*, quæ eundem sonum, imò & significationem habent, non tamen ejusdem sunt Originis, nec *Linguarum una ab alterâ derivatur*. Similitudo enim hæc Vocum quarundam Casu accidere potest, prout multi sunt vultu similes, non tamen ab iis prægnati quorum vultus referunt; & nulla ferè est *Lingua*, quæ ex aliis verba quædam non sit mutuata, ex commercio mutuo, coloniis novis, aliisque Causis. Hoc itaque fixum sit, *varias & reverà diversas fuisse linguas primævas non Primæ Dialectos*. Proleg. 1. §. 10.

(f) Pag. 6, 7.

only

only Act of God in the Babel-Confusion was *the making the Workmen quarrel; and thereby inducing them to part, and so leave their Work unfinished*. But yet, you see, some Act of God they all appear to have believ'd in that extraordinary Event, agreeably to the sacred Text, and *look'd upon it to be equally the work of God, whether they quarrell'd with one another by his Command, or parted for want of understanding one another's Speech*. They like Men of Judgment and Understanding, knew very well the just and proper Extent of their own Knowledge, and found no manner of Difficulty in reconciling whatever Discoveries they made either probable or certain, with sacred History. So that your fallacious Insinuation, that any Men of Letters had rejected the whole story of Babel as recorded in *Genesis*, is without the least Countenance from any Quarter. It is saying and inferring more than was ever thought or dreamt of, by the Tracers of Languages, they being Men of Religious Principles founded on Reason, Learning, and Truth, that had studied themselves into the justest Abhorrence and Contempt of all Profaneness, Impiety, and *Free-thinking*. The only account that I can possibly give of your gross Misrepresentation of them, is from your not distinguishing between Scripture itself and one certain Interpretation of it. As to Scripture, there is
not

not a single Verse, Word, or Syllable in the 11th Chapter of *Genesis*, relating to the Babel-Confusion, whose divine Authority was ever Disputed by the *Tracers of Languages*. The only thing in Dispute and Controversy among them, was the proper Sense and meaning. שפה *Sapha Lip* or *Language*, נבלל *Nabelá let us confound*, & בלל *balál confounded*, were ever allow'd to be of sacred Original, however the *Men of Letters* were divided in their different interpretations of those words. And you may with equal propriety of thought and Expression, suggest and pronounce other Passages innumerable in both Old and New Testament, *suspected, uncertain, precarious, and making but little impression on Men of Learning*, because their Obscurity and Ambiguity has so much divided the *Men of Learning* in their Opinions about them.

THE whole of what has been said, may receive so much Light and Confirmation from the late very Learned and judicious Compilers of Universal History, that I need not scruple inserting the following Passage from them.

The speaking one common language (though it might be of advantage to mankind in other respects) yet being the great obstacle to that division of them into distinct nations which God had for most wise purposes resolved on, he thought
fit

fit to break this bond which held them so strictly together, and confound their language, that they should not understand one anothers speech; the natural consequence of which was that they were scattered abroad upon the face of all the earth. This event is mention'd by profane historians, who write that mankind used one and the same language till the overthrow of the tower of Babylon; at which time a multiplicity of tongues was introduced by the gods: whereupon wars ensued, and those whose speech happened to be intelligible to each other, joined company, and seized such countries as they chanced to light upon.

As to the degree of this Babylonish confusion, and the manner wherein it was effected, there is great diversity of sentiments. Several learned Men, prepossessed with an opinion that all the different idioms now in the world did at first arise from one original language, to which they may be reduced, and that the variety which we find among them is no more than must naturally have happened in so long a course of time, supposing a bare separation of the builders of Babel, have been induced to believe that there were no new languages formed at the confusion, but that the most that was done was only to set those builders at variance, by creating a misunderstanding among them. This some think to have been effected without any immediate influence on their language, which
seems

seems contrary to the words and obvious intent of the sacred historian: others have imagined it brought about by a temporary confusion of their speech, or rather of their apprehensions, causing them, while they continued together, though they spake the same language, yet to understand the words differently. A third opinion is, that a variety of inflexions was introduced, and perhaps some new words, which disturbed and perverted the former manner of expression: and this might occasion different dialects, yet could not create new languages. But none of these explications seem fully to answer the apparent design of Moses, which was not only to inform us how mankind were at first dispersed and broken into so many different nations, but to account for the diversity of their languages; a thing very difficult, if not impossible to do, without having recourse to some extraordinary interposition of the divine power. For though time, intercourse with foreign nations, commerce, the invention and improvement of arts and sciences, and the difference of climates cause very considerable alterations in languages, yet the utmost effect we can imagine them to have will not come up to the question. We cannot conceive a language can thereby be so much disfigured, that all the general marks and characteristics should disappear. It is not easy to apprehend how all the words of a language should be intirely chang'd for others; nor is there

there any one instance to be given of any such total change: but it is next to impossible to conceive that so great a diversity as we find in the frame and constitution of languages, wherein the grand and essential differences between them consist, rather in the words which compose them, (as may be observed in the accounts we shall hereafter give of the several languages of which we have any knowledge) could ever have been occasioned by the causes assigned above. The present diversity of tongues in the world is prodigious; and considering the time that has elapsed since the building of Babel, and the alterations made in some known languages in the course of one, two, and three thousand Years, (which alterations we constantly find greater or less in proportion to the intercourse the nation has had with foreigners) and considering that there are many tongues which when compared with others have not the least affinity, so that a man must be the greatest visionary in the world to imagine them the offspring of the same parent, it seems to us that the variety of idioms now spoken can be no way possibly accounted for, without either approving the preadamite system, or allowing a formation of new languages at Babel. A very learned man, who warmly espouses the notion of deducing all languages from one, is yet so sensible that exceptions must be made, that he himself excludes the languages

F of

of America and of the Indian islands out of the Number ; adding, that some have thence rashly imagined, that the Men who speak those tongues are of a distinct species, and not the descendants of Adam: which concession is enough to overthrow the hypothesis he would maintain.

Some learned men however have endeavoured to derive all languages in general from the Hebrew, which they imagine to be the parent of all others. That they should succeed very well in finding a great conformity between that and the other oriental tongues is no wonder, since they are manifestly sprung from one common original ; though it be difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the mother from the daughters. That they have also given tolerable satisfaction in deducing from the same tongue several words not only in the Greek and Latin, but in some other European languages, is not matter of such surprize, considering the great intercourse several nations of our continent had with the Phœnicians, whose mother tongue was the Hebrew. But when these Writers venture out of their depth, and pretend to deduce the more remote languages from the same fountain, they only shew their ignorance, and make themselves ridiculous to all who have but a moderate skill in those tongues ; for a proof of which we could produce a multitude of examples from a celebrated and laborious work of that kind. As to the peculiar
ex-

excellencies found in the Hebrew tongue by some of its patrons, and which they imagine to be an additional proof of the justness of its pretensions, we may say something hereafter, when we come to give an account of this language.

Upon the whole, we think we may reasonably conclude, with a very learned person whose sentiments on this head we entirely approve, that upon the confusion of Babel there were new languages framed; whose languages have been the roots and originals from which the several dialects that are, or have been, or will be spoken as long as this earth shall last have arisen, and to which they may with ease be reduc'd.

In what manner these new languages were formed is a question hard to be determined; it seems by the Mosaical account, which is so solemn, and represents GOD as coming down in person to view the work of these builders, that it was the immediate act of GOD; and some have thence concluded, that he effected it by inducing an oblivion of their former tongue, and instantaneously infusing others in their minds, according to their several nations. The Jews imagine this was done by the ministry of Angels, seventy of whom descended with GOD, and were each of them set over a nation to which they taught a peculiar Language; but Israel fell to the lot of his own inheritance, the LORD's portion being his people, and therefore, they say, they retained the primitive tongue. Others have supposed, that GOD did

no more than cause them to forget their first language, leaving them to form new ones as they could; but this must have taken up some time, and could not answer the immediate occasions of mankind. As it would be to little purpose to enquire so curiously into this matter, as some have done, the best we can do is to conclude, that it was effected instantly, in a way and manner of which we can give no account.

It would be of as little use to collect the several opinions in relation to the number of languages formed at Babel: we may as well allow the number of seventy, just mentioned, as any other. We only know from Moses, that the Canaanitish or Hebrew, the Syriac and Egyptian languages were formed so soon as the time of Jacob. It is most probable that the languages of the chief families were fundamentally different from each other, and that the sub-languages or dialects within each branch, for the sake of immediate intercourse, had a mutual affinity, some more, some less, according as they settled near or farther from each other. And this was sufficient to bring about the designs of GOD to divide mankind into distinct societies, kingdoms, and commonwealths, and thereby to occasion the making of wholesome laws, the keeping of strict discipline, the encouragement of labour and industry of liberal arts, and all social virtues, and the suppression of such vices as weaken government and introduce a corruption of morals. All which opened a new scene

scene of providence, with a surprizing variety of wisdom, in the government of the world (e).

BEFORE I dismiss this Subject, I cannot but offer a Consideration or two in answer to what Mr. *Le Clerc* has observ'd on the word שפָּה *Sapha*. He would have the word interpreted *Agreement* or *Confederacy* not of *Language* (f); and then the 1st verse of *Genesis* Chap. 11, will run thus. *And the whole Earth was one Agreement, and of one Speech*. Now besides what Dr. *Wooton* has justly objected to this Interpretation, I cannot but think it very material, that the Verse concludes, *וְדַבָּרִים אֶחָדִים* *Udhebbharim Abadhim* *and of one Speech*. Which to me is a manifest exposition of the foregoing words, or at least such a Restriction of them, as renders Mr. *Le Clerc's* interpretation of the word *Sapha* either improper or ineffectual. But a Passage a little lower seems to be a clear and indisputable confutation of it, in verse 7. *Let us go down and there confound their Language, that they may not understand one another's Speech*. These last words have a singular Weight and Authority in them, and serve not only to overthrow Mr. *Le Clerc*, but to establish also the general Opinion, that Confusion of Languages was really an Act of the Divine Power and Wrath. The *Hebrew* word which we translate *Speech* is *Sapha*, as in the beginning

(e) *Univ. Hist.* B. 1. C. 2, §. 5.

(f) *Cleric* in *Gen.* XI. 1. 7.

of this 7th and the 1st Verse. Now substitute in this place Mr. *Le Clerc's Agreement or Confederacy*, and then the Passage will run thus, *that they may not understand one anothers Confederacy*. Where is the Sense? Every one must see the evident necessity of interpreting *Sapba*, with *Vatablus*, *Drusius*, *Bochart*, *Grotius*, and others, *Lip* or *Language*. And if *Sapba* must necessarily have that Sense in the latter part of the Verse, it must also have the same Sense in the beginning both of this 7th and the 1st Verse, in order to preserve the just ἀπὸδοσις. This Argument, I confess, seems to me unanswerable, and perhaps its force may be favourably allow'd by so great a Professor of Reason and Critique as Mr. *Le Clerc*.

I WILL now conclude this Discourse with several very remarkable and considerable Testimonies neither *Jewish* nor *Christian* in favour of the *Mosaick* History of Babel. The first is from a Fragment of *Abydenus's* Assyrian History preserv'd in Eusebius (g).

There are some (says he) who relate, that the first of Mankind, rising out of the Earth, and elated exceedingly with their (prodigious)

(g) Præpar. Evang. Lib. 9 Cap. 14. Ἐπὶ δ' οἱ λέγουσι τὰς πρώτας ἐκ γῆς ἀναχόντας, ῥάμνη π καὶ μεγίθει χαυνωθέντας, καὶ δὴ Θεῶν καταφρονησάντας ἀμείνονας εἶναι (πύργων) τύρσιν ἡλίσσασθαι ὡς αὐτοὶ, ἵνα οὖν Βαβυλῶν ἐπὶ ἡδὴτι ἄσσοι εἶναι τὴν ἕραν καὶ τὰς ἀνέμους θεοῖσι βοηθόντας (vel βοηθίοντας, Cyrillo εἰδιόοντας) ἀνατρέψαι περὶ αὐτοῖσι τὸ μηχανήμα· τῷ δὲ τὰ ἐρείπια λέγεσθαι Βαβυλῶνα. Τίς δὲ οἷτος ἐμυγλώσους ἐκ θεῶν πολύβερε (forte πολύβροον) φωνὴν ἐνείκα.

strength

strength and size, and thinking, to make themselves superiour even to the Gods themselves, rais'd a monstrous high Tower, and that they had almost got up to Heaven, when the Winds coming to the Assistance of the Gods, overturn'd their structure about them; and that having continued till that time of one and the same language, were thenceforward divided by the Gods into many. This passage of *Abydenus*, is quoted likewise by *Cyril*, in his first Book against *Julian* with very little Variation.

THE next is of the famous *Alexander*, call'd from his great Learning *Polyhistor*, who flourish'd in *Sylla's* time, about the 173^d Olympiad. He not only appears as an Evidence himself, but produces two others in Attestation of the same thing. Thus he speaks in *Eusebius* (b).

EUPOLEMUS in his *Treatise of the Jews* (the Latin Interpreter *Vigerus* is much mistaken in his Version of this Passage) says, that *Babylon the City of Assyria, was first built by those who were sav'd from the Deluge; that they were Giants, and that they were the Persons that rais'd the Tower, so much celebrated in History. But that upon its being overthrown*

(b) Ibid. Cap. 17. Εὐπόλεμος δὲ ἐν τῇ περὶ Ἰουδαίων, ἔ' Ασσυρίαις (not as in the Editions, Ἰουδαίων ἔ' Ασσυρίαις,) φησὶ πάλιν Βαβυλωνία πρῶτον μὲν κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ διασωθέντων ἐκ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ ἑταί' αὐτῶν Γίγαντας οἰκοδομεῖν ἃ ἔ' ἱερῶν μὲν πύργον. Πεσόντος ἃ τήτου ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἰσχυρείας τοὺς Γίγαντας διασφαλεῖν καὶ ὅλως τὴν γῆν.

by the immediate Act of God the Giants were dispers'd over the whole Earth.

THE same Author in St. Cyril produces a Sibyl, delivering Her self to this effect (i).

THE Sibyl says, *That all Mankind being (for some time) of one Language, some of them built a prodigious Tower, in order to scale Heaven; But that God sending down his Winds upon the Tower, (totally) overthrew it and gave to every one a distinct Language; and that from thence the City was call'd Babylon.*

THE very words of the Sibyl are extant in Josephus's Antiquities (k).

THESE small but rare and valuable Fragments of Antiquity, how little soever they may seem to influence the Question in dispute, may at least, I hope, have the general Effect of all other antient History upon you and the Reader, in giving a sensible Pleasure to the Mind, and agreeable Entertainment to a Learned Curiosity.

(i) Lib. 1. cont. Julian. Σίβυλλα δὲ φησὶν, ὁμοφώνων ὄντων πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πῶς τέτων πύργον ὑπερυψίθη οἰκοδομήσαντες, ὅπως εἰς τὸ ἕρπονδι ἀναβῶσι, τοῦ ἧ Θεοῦ ἀνέμους τῷ πύργῳ ἐμψυσαντες, ἀνέτρεψαν αὐτὸν ἐῖς ἰδίαν δοξαίαν φωνὴν ἐκάστης· διὸ δὴ Βαβυλῶνα τὴν πόλιν κληθῆναι.

(k) Lib. 1. Cap. 4. Περὶ ἧ τοῦ πύργου τέτου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλοφώνων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μέμνηται ἡ Σίβυλλα λέγουσα ἕτως· Πάντων ὁμοφώνων ὄντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πύργον ὠκοδόμησαν πῶς ὑψηλότερον, ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ ἕρπονδι ἀναβῆσθαι δι' αὐτοῦ· Οἱ ἧ Θεοὶ ἀνέμους ἐπιέμπυσαντες, ἀνέτρεψαν τὸν πύργον, καὶ ἰδίαν ἐκάστη φωνὴν ἔδωκαν.

Addend. p. 27.

[ANY more than the Head of *Nile*.] This Phrase I had used proverbially, following the Language still current amongst us; but I would not contend for the Justness or Propriety of it, since whatever Exceptions or Doubts have been started against the *Portuguese* or *Ludolphus's* Accounts of the *Nile*, as rising in Mount *Dengla* in *Goiama*, I esteem the Evidence from them concerning the true Source of that River, to be so great and satisfactory, that we may justly acquiesce in it, as really indisputable.

REMARKS

Addressed to the

At more than the Head of A. This
I think I had not previously follow-
ed the language till current amongst us; but
I would not contend for the justice of pro-
port of it, since whatever Exceptions or
Doubts have been started against the Testi-
mony of Archbishop's Account of the Vols
which in Major Dwyer's Account, I esteem
the Evidence from them concerning the time
of that River, to be to great and in-
dubitable, that we may justly say in it
is really indubitable.

P H L E G O N

EXAMINED

Critically and Impartially.

THE F.G.O.V.



EX LIBRIS

Physiology and Anthropology

P H L E G O N

EXAMINED

Critically and Impartially.

In Answer to the late DISSERTATION
and DEFENCE of Dr. SYKES.

To which is added a

POSTSCRIPT,

Explaining a PASSAGE in

TERTULLIAN.

By JOHN CHAPMAN, D. D.

The SECOND EDITION.

Videmur fanè melius consulturi Rei Christianæ, & Honori Sospitatoris nostri, si insigne hoc Prodigium etiam Hostium nostrorum ore confirmemus; imprimis cum nihil repugnet; quàm si illud evertendo, vel unum armorum genus, quibus, adspirante Divino favore, cum successu uti possumus, ex manibus Christianorum excutiamus. *Reland. Palæstin. illustrat.* Tom. I. p. 30.

L O N D O N:

Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball in
Ave-Mary-Lane. MDCCXLII.

P H L E G O N

EXAMINED

Critically and Impartially.

In Answer to the late DISSERTATION
and DEFENCE of Dr. SYKES.

To which is added a

POSTSCRIPT.

Explaining the PASSAGE in

TERTULLIAN.

By JOHN CHAPMAN, D.D.

The Second Edition.

Testimonium sancti melius consilium Rei Christianae, & Monachi Solipi-
tensis auctoritatis, si insigne hoc prodigium etiam Hebraeorum nostror-
um esse confirmamus; impletis cum aliis testibus; quoniam
si illud eveniendo, vel nam argumentum genus, quibus, adopi-
tante illius favore, cum facillime ut possimus ex manifestis
Christianorum excusamus. Richard. P. A. 1784. Tom. I.

P. 30.

L O N D O N :

Printed for S. BART, at the Bible and Ball in
New-Market Lane. MDCCLXXII.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN first Dr. Sykes's *Dissertation* came abroad, I had not a thought of passing one single Remark upon it in Print, expecting to see it freely and accurately examin'd by some abler Hands; and promising to my self the agreeable Entertainment of a Reader, without the trouble of a Writer. Neither was I disappointed in the Event; for before many Months had passed, I had the pleasure to see the Point debated learnedly and copiously by several ingenious Gentlemen, who acquitted themselves so well upon the occasion, as to leave but little room for any new Improvements, and to me, I am sure, very small Encouragement to come after them. But at last some Persons, with whom I have the honour to be acquainted, thinking the Subject not quite exhausted, were pleas'd to desire, that I would enter into this dispute, and they by repeated Importunities prevailed upon me to engage in it. This must be my Apology to the Reader for troubling him so late with my Thoughts concerning *Phlegon*, and to Dr. Sykes for thus appearing against him in Publick.

THAT Gentleman it seems out of an ardent Zeal for the *Service of Christianity* is willing
A to

2 INTRODUCTION.

to remove out of the way, whatever either can be prov'd to be false, or at best cannot be prov'd to be true. Pref. to Def. p. 8. He is firmly of opinion, that the *Addition of very disputable, if not totally impertinent Testimonies* does but weaken the Evidence for Christianity, and can never possibly add any force to what is urged for the truth of it. Introd. to Dissert. p. 5. And herein, I freely acknowledge, he has my concurrence, and who they are, that will oppose him in it, I know not. But I must beg leave to observe on the other side, that we are not obliged upon any Principle to give up a Testimony immediately, because it happens to be *disputed*, or to judge it to be *false and impertinent* upon every suggestion of its being so. Were this to be the case, we must e'en give up the strongest Evidences in favour of Christianity, the *Prophecies* and *Miracles*, which attest and support it; for all these both in *antient* and *modern* times have met with very violent Adversaries, who have us'd their utmost Endeavours to wrest and extort them from us. By which I do not mean to rank the *Testimony*, which is now the Subject of Debate, with those *prime and fundamental* Evidences of Christianity, upon which it is chiefly built, and must for ever rest; but only to shew in general, that the *Truth and Validity* of Testimonies and Evidences must not depend on the *Assent or Dissent* of particular Persons, but on their own *real Weight and Authority*. We see every Day such amazing Instances of
Weakness,

INTRODUCTION. 3

Weakness, Blindness, Fancy, and Extravagance in Men, that were we to take our estimate of *things* from thence alone, we could hardly admit one Truth in a thousand as certain and *indisputable*. I would not deny in the mean time, that some *Truths* there are, and some *Testimonies* and *Evidences*, which a Man may doubt of and dispute, without incurring Reproaches or hurting his Reputation among judicious Men, if he does it with *Candour* and *Modesty*. Neither am I unwilling to allow, that the Testimony of *Pblegon* now before us is of such a kind; and I am sensible, that considerable Men have published their Doubts of it before Dr. Sykes. It is not esteem'd (by any one that I know of) one of the grand and principal Supports of Christianity, the removal of which would shake the whole Superstructure; neither is it supposed to carry such a dazzling and irresistible Light with it, that a Man cannot disown it without shutting his eyes. No. This is not what any one contends for. It is urged only as collateral and supernumerary Evidence, to confirm and illustrate what is *fully* and *sufficiently* established upon other Authorities. And as it may have its value and subordinate uses in this view, I do not think it necessary wholly to discard and renounce it, while Reason and Criticism appear to me to favour and defend it. It is worth considering with some degree of Care and Attention as a celebrated Passage in History, and worth disputing with some degree of Zeal and Earnestness,

4 INTRODUCTION.

ness, as it may serve to *corroborate* and *adorn* the Gospel. What farther encourages me to offer something concerning *Phlegon*, is the great Regard, which Men of the highest Character for Learning, Penetration, and Judgment have all along express'd towards it, and continue to express at this day. Such were *Grotius*^a, *Huetius*^b, *Tillemont*^c, and *Reland*^d, and such now living are *Fabricius*^e, and *Wolffius*^f; besides many others, that I could name. Men so eminently distinguished as these are in the Learned World, declaring in favour of *Phlegon*, notwithstanding the Scruples and Exceptions of *Kepler*, *Vossius*, *Bayle*, and *Basnage*, incline me to think, that *Phlegon* may yet be defended with good grace even against the Learned Dr. *Sykes*, who seems, as far as I can discern, to argue pretty much in *their* way, and upon the same Hypothesis.

As to the *Chinese* Accounts of an extraordinary Darkness in antient times, I shall leave them to those who are better Judges and great

(a) Grot. in Matt. c. XXVII. V. 46.

(b) Huet. Demonstr. Evang. Propos. III. §. 8, 9.

(c) Memoires Tom. I. Notes XXXV. Sur N. S. Jesus Christ.

(d) Reland. Palæstin. Illust. Tom. I. cap. V.

(e) Quamquam Chronologicis quibusdam Difficultatibus permoti quidam Viri Doctissimi de aliâ Eclipsi loqui Phlegontem existimant—— non tamen usque adè explorata mihi videntur illorum Rationes, ut non malim veteribus assentiri, cum certissimum sit Phlegontem etiam alia de Rebus Christi & Judæorum Chronico suo inseruisse. *Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Lib. IV. c. 13.*

(f) Curæ Criticæ & Philolog. Tom. I. p. 407.

INTRODUCTION. 5

ter Admirers of them. I would not undertake to dispute about Histories, which I cannot consult my self, and of which all my Knowledge must be fetched from the Relations and Extracts of Travellers. My Business is only with *Greek* and *Latin* Writers; who are better known, and more easily examined. And as *Phlegon* has no relation to the *Chinese* or dependence upon them, he may well enough be taken separately from them, and may now be introduced without further ceremony.



PHLEGON

PHLEGON

Examined, &c.

I.

PHLEGON was born at *Tralles* a City of *Lydia*, and when he grew up became a *Libertus* or *Freedman* of the Emperor *Adrian*^a. Some had reported, as *Suidas*^b informs us, that he was a *Libertus* of the Emperor *Augustus*. But this was a great mistake, and has been fully disproved by Learned Men^c from *Phlegon* himself. He was a Man much esteem'd for his Learning, and the Works which he published. Among other Pieces, of which there is a Catalogue and Critical Account in *Fabricius*^d, he wrote one of more Note and Eminence than the rest, entituled, *Ολυμπιονικῶν & Χρονικῶν συναγωγή*^e, or a *Chronological Account of the Victors at the Olympic Games, and of all*

(a) Spartian. in Hadrian. cap. 16. Vopiscus in Saturnin. cap VII. Phot. Cod. 97.

(b) Suid. v. Φλέγων.

(c) Salmas. in Spartian. Hadrian. cap. 16. Vossius. Histor. Græc. Lib. 2. c. 11.

(d) Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. L. IV. c. XII.

(e) Ap. Phot. Cod. 97.

the most remarkable Occurrences, which happened in every Olympiad, beginning with the 1st Olympiad, and continued down to the 229th, in sixteen Books^f. This, if one may judge from the taste which *Photius* has given us of it, must have been a very useful and valuable Work, and of great service towards settling many Points in Antient Chronology. But unfortunately for us, these Books are not now extant, and nothing but a few Fragments (of which the Passage now in dispute is one) and notices of them remain, just enough to make us lament the irreparable loss of the rest. How long they were in being, before they were totally lost, cannot now (I think,) be determined with any certainty. We know they were extant in *Photius's* time, who lived in the Ninth Century, because he had them in his own hands, made considerable extracts out of them, and as he tells us himself, had read, when he wrote his *Bibliotheca*, as far as the 177th Olympiad. It seems evident likewise from *Suidas*, that he too had seen them entire. For he tells us the number of Books in the whole Work, and in what Olympiad they end, and uses the word ἐν of them as of Books then extant, without the least hint of their being lost either in whole or in part at that time.

(f) Εγγραψεν Ολυμπιάδας ἐν βιβλίοις ις. ἕως δὲ μέχρι τῆς σκθ' Ολυμπιάδος τὰ πραχθέντα πανταχῶ. Suid.

(g) Ubi supra.

Now the Age of *Suidas*, which has so often been the subject of dispute among the Criticks, I would not pretend to fix exactly. But I am of opinion, that he compos'd his Lexicon in the latter end of the tenth Century or in the beginning of the eleventh, before A. D. 1025. For in one place^h he speaks of *Basilus* and *Constantinus* as then reigning at *Constantinople*, who succeeded *Joannes Zimisces* in the Throne A. D. 975. and reigned together till the year 1025. I am sensible that some very Learned and Judicious Men *Gerard Vossius*ⁱ and *Fabricius*^k have placed him in the latter end of the 11th Century. And *Fabricius* urges two Passages of *Suidas**, where *Michael Psellus* is quoted. That Author had dedicated^l a Book (now extant in MS. in the King of *France's* Library) to *Michael Ducas* Son of *Constantine Ducas*, between the years 1071 and 1078. And this Book of his has the very words to which *Suidas* refers; and to make the Argument the stronger, these Passages are retained in the oldest Manuscripts of *Suidas*, that *Kuster* consulted. To all which I could add, that *Suidas*^m has

(h) Τῶν καυχόντων τὰ σκῆπτρα τῆς βασιλείας Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς καὶ Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Πορφυρογεννητὴν. *Suidas* v. Κωνσταντῖνος.

(i) Voss. de Hist. Græc. Lib. 2. c. 26.

(k) Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Tom. IX. p. 626.

(*) *Suidas* v. Δέρτρα. v. Ἡγήτορες.

(l) The Title of the Book in the MSS. is, as follows. Ψίλλου σύνταξις διὰ τῶν σαφῶν ἑκ πολιτικῶν ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν ἐπιστημῶν, γνησιότητι πρὸς τὸν ὑποτίθεισάν τινι βασιλῆα κύριον Μιχαὴλ τὸν Δάκην ἐκ πρῶτον γράμματος τῆς Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ βασιλείας. Fabric. ubi sup. p. 625.

(m) *Suidas* v. Ἀμυσί.

transcribed a Passage *verbatim* from *Xiphiline*, who publish'd an Epitome of *Dion Cassius*. And this *Xiphiline* did not write before the year 1070. But upon considering the Evidence on both sides, the Chronological Passage above appears to me of the greatest weight. For this cannot easily be accounted for on any other supposition, but that of *Suidas* himself being the Author of it. Whereas the other might be added by some later Writer, as we know several Passages certainly are. Another Argument in favour of my Hypothesis I may take from our most eminent Critick Dr. *Bentley*ⁿ. He observes, that *Suidas* calls *Symeon Metaphrastes* μακαρίτης of blessed memory, which appellation he believes is never used in Greek, but of Persons not long dead, and within the memory of him that says it. Now this *Symeon*, he says, was in Office under *Leo*, who died 58 years, before *Suidas*'s Chronology ends, and consequently flourish'd in the former part of the 10th Century. From whence it appears improbable, that *Suidas* should write above an hundred years after *Symeon*; as he must have done, if he liv'd towards A. D. 1100. For these reasons I chuse with Dr. *Cave*^o and Dr. *Bentley* to place *Suidas* under the Emperors *Basilus* and *Constantinus*.

(n) Dr *Bentley*'s Dissertat. on Phalaris. p. 22, 23.

(o) *Cave* Hist. Literar. Vol. 1. p. 587.

B

THUS

THUS far we may trace the Chronological Works of *Pblegon*; but how long they were preserv'd beyond this time, I know not, neither is it very material at present to enquire. It may suffice to have said so much in general of *Pblegon* and his Works, as may serve to prepare the way for what follows, and be of use in judging of some antient Authorities to be produced hereafter.

II.

Now the Question between me and Dr. *Sykes* is manifestly this, *viz.* Whether that remarkable Eclipse, which is mentioned by *Pblegon* in a certain Fragment of his *Olympiads*, has any relation to the darkness, which happened at our Saviour's Passion. Dr. *Sykes* has thought fit to maintain the Negative. For the proof of which, one or other of these two things must be alledged. Either 1st. That the year of *Pblegon's* Eclipse, according to the common reading of his Text, does not coincide with the true year of our Saviour's Passion. Or 2d. That the present Text of *Pblegon* with regard to the year of his Eclipse is faulty in the common editions, and that another reading of it is certainly genuine. This alternative is admitted on all sides. Now the thing, upon which Dr. *Sykes* chuses to build his Hypothesis, is the 2d of the two abovementioned. He allows, that the year of *Pblegon's* Eclipse according to the common reading

reading of the Text does really coincide with the true year of our Saviour's Passion; and declares moreover, that *were we sure, this was the true reading of Phlegon, there could be no dispute*^p. The reading therefore of *Pblegon* is what Dr. S. is pleased to dispute, and upon this alone he has rested the merits of the whole Controversy. Here then is the grand and necessary Point, which must now be debated; and if we can clearly and solidly vindicate the present reading of *Pblegon*, Dr. S. I am perswaded from his *known* Candor and Ingenuity, will own himself effectually confuted, and will *not be sorry to have this additional Testimony unquestionable*^q.

THE way, which I shall take to defend *Pblegon*, is that which is always made use of in these cases, and is such as all Criticks require and acquiesce in, being indeed the only one that can properly be made use of in disputes of this kind. It is to be remember'd, that the Passage of *Pblegon* now before us, is only a small Fragment of a large and noble Work; which some antient Writers have preserv'd down to us. So that to know, what the Passage it self is, and what is the true and genuine reading of it, our business must be to consult those antient

(p) Dissert. p. 48.

(q) Introduct. p. 6.

12 *Antient Testimonies.* Eusebius.

Writers, and to examine, how it stands at present in them.

III.

I. THE first Writer, that gives us the Passage professedly in the very words (αὐτοῖς ῥήμασιν) of *Pblegon*, is *Eusebius*^(r), and it runs thus. Τῷ δ' ἔτει τῆς σβ. Ολυμπιάδος ἐγένετο ἑκλειψις ἡλίου μεγίστη ἧ ἔγνωισμείων πρῶτον. Καὶ νύξ ὥρα ἕκτη τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἄστρας οὐ βράνω φανῆναι. Σεισμός μέγας κατὰ Βιθυνίαν γινόμενος τὰ πολλὰ τῆς Νικαίας κατεπρέψατο. In the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad there happened an Eclipse of the Sun the greatest that had been observ'd before. And there was Night at the sixth hour of the day, so that the Stars appeared in the Heavens, And (at the same time) a great Earthquake in Bithynia overthrew a great part of (the City) of Nice. You see, this Eclipse and Earthquake mentioned by *Pblegon* is said to have happened in the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad, the very year in which Dr. *Sykes*⁽¹⁾ himself places the Passion of our Saviour Christ.

Now that δ' ἔτει is the true reading of *Pblegon* in *Eusebius*, is clear beyond all exception from the Latin Version of this Passage of *Eusebius* composed by *Jerom*⁽²⁾, and that of *Anastasi*

(r) Apud Syncel. p. 325.

(1) Dissertat. p. 10.

(2) Quarta autem anno CCII. Olympiadis magna & excellens inter

Kepler's *Exceptions Answer'd.* 13

Stafius Bibliothecarius about the year 870. Both these Writers have *quarto anno* Olympiad. 202; and their Translations must be look'd upon as two distinct Originals, and not as if one was only a transcript from the other. For tho' they both translate the same Passage of *Eusebius*, yet their Translations of it are very different, as any one may see, that will but cast his eye upon them in the Margin. Add to this, that all the MSS. of *Syncellus*, which *Goar* consulted, agree in expressing the Greek numeral δ .

THE Learned *Kepler* endeavouring to free his own Hypothesis from some difficulties arising from *Pblegon*, trifles exceedingly upon this Passage of *Eusebius*. When *Calvisius* objected to him *Jerom's quarto anno*, his Answer^w to him is, *But what if Jerom himself was mistaken? There is great room, says he, for suspecting, that the particle δ was mistaken by him for the numeral letter δ.* Why so? Did *Jerom* know so

inter omnes, quæ ante eam acciderant, Defectio Solis facta; dies horâ sextâ ita in tenebrosam noctem versus, ut stellæ in cælo visæ sint, terræque motus in Bithyniâ Nicææ Urbis multas ædes subvertit. Hieron. Chron. Lat.

(u) Porro *quarto* anno ducentessimæ secundæ Olympiadis facta est Defectio Solis maxima, & nox horâ sextâ Diei facta est, ita ut etiam stellæ in cælo apparerent. Terræ motus etiam magnus in Bithyniâ factus plurima Nicææ subvertit. *Anastaf. Histor. Eccl. p. 14. Ed. Par.*

(w) Hieronymus, inquis, vertit anno quarto? Quid igitur si & ipse est hallucinatus? Magna suspicio est voculam δ pro numerali perperam sumptam. *Kepler. Eclog. Chron. p. 87.*

14 Kepler's *Exceptions* *Examin'd.*

little of *Greek*, as not to be able to distinguish one from the other? But the ground of this suspicion, it seems, is^x, that *Jerom* read plainly not τῷ Δ' ἔτει, but τῷ δ' Δ' ἔτει, as appears by his *quarto* autem anno. A notable Argument indeed! Because he read the particle δ' in *Eusebius*, therefore he did not read also the numeral δ. Wonderful Logic this, and worthy so great a Philosopher! I should be glad to know from any Advocate for *Kepler* these two things.

1st. IF upon his supposition, there were no numeral δ. but only the particle δ' in *Eusebius*, how *Jerom* came by his *autem* and *quarto* too? Surely he could not give us both *autem* and *quarto* for a Latin Translation of one single particle δ'.

2. How *Jerom* can here be suspected of having mistaken δ' for the numeral δ. when 'tis plain that in this very place he translates the particle δ' by *autem*. What? could *Jerom* be right and wrong about the same particle at the same time? This to me is very strange and incredible.

BUT still the *Greek Text* of *Eusebius*, says *Kepler*^y, is very ambiguous and uncertain. For

(x) Nam si ponderes verba Hieronymi, *Quarto* autem anno, plane constabit ipsum legisse non τῷ δ. ἔτει but τῷ δ' δ. ἔτει. *Ibid.*

(y) Græcus Eusebii textus ambiguus est & lubricus. Nescias enim *Quarto* anno, an simpliciter, anno vero Olymp. CCII. legas. *Ibid.* p. 126.

Kepler's *Exceptions Answer'd.* 15

you cannot tell, whether you ought to read it, in the fourth year, or, But in the year of the 202d Olympiad. Then, say I, there is no such thing as certainty in any Passage of *Eusebius*. And *Scaliger* might as well have saved himself the trouble of publishing an Edition of him. But pray what is it, that makes the *Greek Text* of *Eusebius* so ambiguous and uncertain? Are not *Syncellus* and *Jerom* and *Anastasius* sufficient to establish the δ . and the quarto anno? And is there any Authority for $\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$ without a numeral, besides a random conjecture? If bare suspicions can overthrow such weighty Authorities, neither *Eusebius*, nor the Canon of *Ptolemy*, nor any other Chronological Writer is safe.

BUT after all what is to be done with plain $\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$, when the numeral δ . is struck out? Why, it seems, it is to signify the year when the 202d Olympiad was celebrated, or the first year of that Olympiad. I answer, that the antient *Greeks* never speak in this manner. They always insert a numeral to express the first year of an Olympiad, as well as any other. And therefore Dr. Sykes perceiving that *Kepler* was in some distress, endeavours to help him out by an easy solution of his own. If *Phlegon*, says he, designed the Eclipse in the first year of the 202d Olympiad, the *Greek Text* of *Eusebius* is to be corrected by the smallest alteration possible in the *Greek numbers*, by putting an A instead

stead of a Δ^z . Very true, if Phlegon designed any such thing. But how does it appear, that he did so? Till that be shewn, let us keep the numeral Δ which is antient and well attested, rather than admit another which has no foundation in Antiquity.

II. To confirm the quotation of Eusebius, the *Chronicon Paschale* otherwise called the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* cites Phlegon twice in the same form, introducing him with saying, That the Pagans had taken notice of this year, (the year of the Passion) mentioning expressly an Earthquake as happening at the time, and particularly Phlegon the Collector of Olympiads. For in his XIIIth Book he says thus. In the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad there happened an Eclipse of the Sun, the greatest of any known before &c. We may observe here, how emphatically this Author speaks of Phlegon, and

(2) Dissertat. p. 73, 74.

(a) Καὶ οἱ ἔξαθεν δὲ τῷ καινῷ πύπιν ἐπιστημῆναι, ἀσφαλῶς ἐποιπες καὶ τὸ σισμὸν γινόμενον, καὶ κατ' ἐξαιρέσει Φλέγων ὁ τὰς Ολυμπιάδας συναγαγών. Λέγει δὲ ἐν τῷ γ' συγγραμμῶν, οὕτως τῷ δὲ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΩ ἔτει τῆς σδ. Ολυμπιάδος ἐγένετο ἑκλειψις ἡλίου μεγίστη τῇ ἐγνωσμένων πρῶτον. Καὶ νύξ ἄρα ἔκτῃ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρων ἐν οὐρανῷ φανῆναι. Σεισμὸς μείζων κατὰ Βιθυνίαν γινόμενος. ΤΑΥΤΑ Ο ΔΗΛΩΘΕΙΣ ΑΝΗΡ, γιούς τὸ παράδοξον τῷ ἐκλείψει τοῦ ἡλίου. Chron. Paschal. p. 219.

Ο παρὰ τῆς ἑλλῆσι χρειογράφου ἐξέρησε Φλέγων, ὁ τὰς Ολυμπιάδας πηδικῶς, λιγών. Τῷ δὲ δ. ἔτῃ τῇ σδ. Ολυμπιάδος ἐγένετο ἑκλειψις ἡλίου μεγίστη τῇ ἐγνωσμένων πρῶτον. καὶ νύξ ἄρα ἔκτῃ τῇ ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρων ἐν οὐρανῷ φανῆναι. σισμὸς μείζων κατὰ Βιθυνίαν γινόμενος τὰ πολλὰ τῇ Νικαίᾳ κατιστρίψατο. Ταῦτα ὁ δὲ λαοὶς ἀνῆρ. Ibid. p. 222. Ed. Cang.

how little room there is to doubt, that he transcribed these words of *Pblegon* from *Pblegon* himself. And what is farther remarkable, he expresses in one place the *fourth* year not by the numeral Δ but by $\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omega$ at length, which makes any mistake in the number less easy and less probable. *His repetition likewise of the same words*, as an ingenious Writer has well observed^b, *must be look'd upon as a confirmation of the Authority, tho' in the same Book, because it shews, that in the first Text there was no accidental mistake.*

I must farther observe to the Reader, that these Testimonies of the *Chronicon Paschale* are probably much more antient, than they are commonly supposed and represented. The generality of Writers thrust down this *Chronicon* in gross without any distinction as low as the 7th Century. Whereas we are informed by the last Learned Editor of it *Dufresne*^c, that it is really made up of two parts, composed by different Authors at different times. The first began with *Adam* and ended A. D. 354. in the XVIIth of the Emperor *Constantius*, the second continued it down from that year, to the XXth of the Emperor *Heraclius* A. D. 630. And this discovery of *Dufresne* is confirmed by the great *Fabricius*^d. Now the Te-

(b) Letter to Dr. Sykes p. 12.

(c) Præfat. in Chron. Paschal. p. VIII.

(d) Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Tom. VI. p. 142.

testimonies cited above from the *Chronicon* are extant in the former part of it, and consequently need not be placed lower than A. D. 354, a few years after *Eusebius*. These circumstances of the *Chronicon Paschale* lead me to wonder, why Dr. Sykes, who professes^e to have collected and faithfully represented to the Reader the principal if not all the Passages, which relate to Phlegon's Testimony, among the *Antients*, should pass this over without the least notice in his *Dissertation*. For is not this one of the *Principals* the Doctor talks of? or, was he not apprised of such a Book? or, could he wilfully omit it, as being so strong and express against him? or, what was the reason of it? For my part I will not pretend to determine; the Doctor is the only Person that can explain it.

III. A 3d Writer among the *Greeks*, that has quoted the same Passage of *Phlegon* is *Joannes Philoponus*^f, who flourish'd about the year 600. He too with the Authors produced above appears very plainly to have read in *Phlegon* τετάρτῳ ἔτει the *fourth* year of Ol. 202. For so he has

(e) *Introduct. to Dissert.* p. 6.

(f) Τῆς δὲ τοῦ σκότους, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς νυκτὸς πύτης, καὶ Φλέγων ἐν ταῖς Ολυμπιάσιν ἐμνησθῆναι. Λέγει γὰρ, ὅτι τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτει τῆς διακοσιοῦς δευτέρας Ολυμπιάδος, ἐγένετο ἡλὶς ἐκ λευκῆς μεγίστη ἢ σὺν (dele σὺν) ἐγνωσμένων ἀσέπρον. καὶ οὕτως ὅσα ἔκτε τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥς ἔστιν ἀστέρων ἐν ἐξατῷ φαινῆται. *Philoponus in Genesin. Lib. II. cap. 21. p. 88.*

it expressly in one place^g, putting τετάρτῳ at length, and forming a Chronological Calculation upon it. It is true, that in the first Passage quoted in the Margin, we find δευτέρῳ according to the present Edition of him, but I shall prove below from *Philoponus* himself, that this reading is only a corruption in his Copy.

THESE are all the antient *Greeks*, who have quoted professedly the original words of *Phlegon**. But besides these of the *Greeks*, and *Jerom* and *Anastasius* of the *Latins* produced above, I may subjoin two more *Latin* Writers, the Author of the *Historia Miscella* about the year 784ⁱ, and *Freculphus Lexoviensis*^k about 824. Both these have cited *Phlegon* in their Histories, and both express in their Translations of his words the fourth year of Olympiad 202. Upon all which Testimonies I shall make a

(g) Τὴν δὲ ἐκλείψιν (φησὶν ὁ Φλέγων) γεγεῖναι ἐν τῷ ΤΕΤΑΡΤῳ ἔτη τῆς ἑκατοστοῆς δευτέρας Ολυμπιάδας. Id. Ibid. p. 89.

(*) I take no notice of *Malela* and *Maximus*, because though they both quote *Phlegon*, yet they do it negligently, and not in the words of *Phlegon* himself.

(i) Scribens inter ceteros autem et *Phlegon* — in tertio decimo sermone iisdem verbis asserit hæc. Porro quarto anno ducentesima secundæ Olympiadis facta est defectio Solis maxima, & nox horâ sextâ diei facta est: ita ut etiam stellæ in cœlo apparerent. Terræ motus etiam magnus in Bithyniâ factus plurimam Nicææ partem urbis subvertit. *Hist. Miscell. Lib. VII. p. 227.*

(k) Scribit verò super his & *Phlegon*, qui Olympiadum egregius supputator est, in XIII Libro ita dicens; Quarto autem anno CCII Olympiadis, magna & excellens inter omnes, qui ante eam acciderant, defectio Solis facta est diei horâ sextâ &c. *Freculph. Chron. Tom. II. Lib. I. c. 6.*

testimonies cited above from the *Chronicon* are extant in the former part of it, and consequently need not be placed lower than A. D. 354, a few years after *Eusebius*. These circumstances of the *Chronicon Paschale* lead me to wonder, why Dr. Sykes, who professes to have collected and faithfully represented to the Reader the principal if not all the Passages, which relate to Phlegon's Testimony, among the *Antients*, should pass this over without the least notice in his *Dissertation*. For is not this one of the *Principals* the Doctor talks of? or, was he not apprised of such a Book? or, could he wilfully omit it, as being so strong and express against him? or, what was the reason of it? For my part I will not pretend to determine; the Doctor is the only Person that can explain it.

III. A 3d Writer among the *Greeks*, that has quoted the same Passage of *Phlegon* is *Joannes Philoponus*^f, who flourish'd about the year 600. He too with the Authors produced above appears very plainly to have read in *Phlegon* τετάρτῳ ἔτει the *fourth* year of Ol. 202. For so he has

(e) *Introduct. to Dissert.* p. 6.

(f) Τῆς δὲ τοῦ σκοτεινῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς νυκτὸς πύτης, καὶ Φλέγων ἐν ταῖς Ολυμπιάσιν ἐμνησθῆναι. Λέγει γὰρ, ὅτι τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτει τῆς διακοστῆς δευτέρας Ολυμπιάδος, ἐγένετο ἡλὶς ἐκ λειψίς μεγίστη ἢ σὺν (dele σὺν) ἐγνωσμένων ἀσέπρον. καὶ οὕτως ὥστε ἐκτὴ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε ἑσπέρης ἐν ἑξατῷ φαινῆναι. *Philoponus in Genesin. Lib. II. cap. 21. p. 88.*

expressly in one place^s, putting *τετάρτω* at length, and forming a Chronological Calculation upon it. It is true, that in the first Passage quoted in the Margin, we find *δευτέρω* according to the present Edition of him, but I shall prove below from *Philoponus* himself, that this reading is only a corruption in his Copy.

THESE are all the antient *Greeks*, who have quoted professedly the original words of *Phlegon**. But besides these of the *Greeks*, and *Jerom* and *Anastasius* of the *Latins* produced above, I may subjoin two more *Latin* Writers, the Author of the *Historia Miscella* about the year 784ⁱ, and *Freculphus Lexoviensis*^k about 824. Both these have cited *Phlegon* in their Histories, and both express in their Translations of his words the *fourth* year of Olympiad 202. Upon all which Testimonies I shall make a

(g) Τὴν δὲ ἔκλειψιν (φασὶν ὁ Φλέγων) γεγεῖναι ἐν τῷ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΩ ἔτη τῆς ἀποστολῆς δευτέρας Ολυμπιάδας. Id. Ibid. p. 89.

(*) I take no notice of Malela and Maximus, because though they both quote Phlegon, yet they do it negligently, and not in the words of Phlegon himself.

(i) Scribens inter cæteros autem et *Phlegon* — in tertio decimo sermone *iisdem verbis* asserit hæc. Porro quarto anno ducentissime secundæ Olympiadis facta est defectio Solis maxima, & nox horâ sextâ diei facta est: ita ut etiam stellæ in cælo apparerent. Terræ motus etiam magnus in Bithyniâ factus plurimam Nicææ partem urbis subvertit. *Histor. Miscell. Lib. VII. p. 227.*

(k) Scribit verò super his & *Phlegon*, qui Olympiadum egregius supputator est, in XIII Libro ita dicens; Quarto autem anno CCII Olympiadis, magna & excellens inter omnes, qui ante eam acciderant, defectio Solis facta est diei horâ sextâ &c. *Freculph. Chron. Tom. II. Lib. I. c. 6.*

few Remarks, before I proceed to consider Dr. Sykes's Objections. .

1st. It is proper to observe, that all these *Greek* and *Latin* Writers, that quote or translate this Passage of *Pblegon*, lived while the Works of *Pblegon* were yet in being. For they all flourished before the 10th Century, till which time I have shewn above, that *Pblegon's* Works were extant. From whence it is plain, that all these antient Testimonies may be called *original* ones, that is, such as *might* have been taken from *Pblegon* himself; and therefore must not be discredited as mere *transcripts* of one Author from another, because these Writers were all Men of Learning, and capable of consulting that Author, and no one can prove, that they did not in fact consult him. I am aware of one Objection to some of the *Latins*, that their Translations are almost the same *verbatim*, and therefore that they only copied one from another without ever looking into *Pblegon*. . This perhaps may be said of *Anastafius* and *Freculphus*, the first following the Author of *Historia Miscella* or *Paulus Warnefridus*, and the other *Jerom*. But this sort of Argument (though frequently made use of) does not seem to me very solid and conclusive. For why is it necessary that a Man should not have seen the Original of an Author, because he cites another's Translation of him? Might he not quote a *Latin* Translation
in

in a particular Passage, because he found it very just and agreeable to the Original? And is not this done by the most learned and accurate *Moderns*, who cannot justly be suspected either of negligence or incapacity? And as to these two Writers in particular, *Anastafius* is known to have been a Scholar; *Vir erat*, says Dr. Cave, *pro ævi sui genio nequaquam indoctus; qui utriusque linguæ scientiam tenuit, & cum primariis Sæculi Viris, Photio ac Hincmaro, arctam satis amicitiam coluit*¹. Besides which, he was qualified sufficiently by his Office of *Bibliothecarius* or *Library-Keeper* at *Rome* for a curious and diligent search after Books, and very probably was prefer'd to that Office for his extraordinary abilities in point of Literature. And as to *Freculphus*, he too was a Man of eminence in the Western Church, and more-over assures us himself, that the Passages, which he quotes by name from antient Writers whether Profane or Ecclesiastical, are represented by him as he found them in the *Authors* themselves; *Sententias illorum*, says he, *assumpsi, ut in suis habentur libris*^m. If so, it is certainly not improbable, that he consulted *Phlegon* himself, tho' in his *Latin History* he has adopted *Jerom's* Translation of one Passage of him.

2. I would observe, that here are no less than seven antient Writers three *Greek* and

(1) Cave. *Histor. Liter.* Tom. I. p. 559.

(m) *Freculp. Præf. Chron.*

four *Latin*, all concurring in one uniform representation of a Fragment of *Pblegon*, and in one reading of a controverted numeral. A number very extraordinary, and of great weight in the present case! There is not, I believe, one antient *Chronological* Fragment in a hundred (of those which are now extant) so well attested and supported as this of *Pblegon*. Few there are among the many hundreds, that may now be collected from *Greek* Antiquity Profane and Ecclesiastical, that have more than one Writer to rest upon; a great majority of them depend upon a single evidence; and Men of Learning will, I dare say, think I speak too much within compass, when I call this Fragment of *Pblegon* thus confirmed and illustrated only one of a hundred. Now 'tis plain and indisputable fact, that *Chronological* Fragments of much inferior Authority as to Evidence, many that are quoted but by one Writer and that but once, others not supported by more than two or three, are often alledged by Men of the greatest erudition and skill in Criticism, to prove and settle many important points in antient History. And that even in those, which abound with numerals much more than this of *Pblegon*, and even in opposition to the Testimonies of other antient Authors, who are still preserved entire and unquestionable. Instances of this, were it necessary to be proved, would fill a volume. Now
if

if Fragments of this kind meet with so much regard from the Learned, if they carry so great an Authority with them, and are esteemed of so signal use and consequence to the Critical World, surely this Fragment of *Pblegon*, surrounded with so glaring an Evidence, must deserve an equal if not vastly greater regard, from every candid and judicious Critick. Or on the other side, if so bright an Evidence cannot secure the Text of this Fragment of *Pblegon*, sure I am, that we may e'en set aside many hundreds of valuable Fragments, which are now in repute, and reject many noble conclusions that are formed upon them.

3. IT is a maxim in Criticism generally received and allowed, that where the very words of an Author are expressly and professedly laid down in any antient Writer, such Copy or Representation of them is to be followed, rather than any loose and general account of them in others. Thus in the case before us, when *Eusebius*, the *Chronicon Paschale*, and *Philoponus* declare that such and such are the very words of *Pblegon*, we ought not to set up in opposition to them the loose and imperfect citations in *Africanus*, or *Malelas*, or *Maximus*. And the reason is plain, because there is manifestly much greater evidence from the former concerning *Pblegon's* original words, than from the latter.

4. As we are furnished from the Writers abovementioned with such direct and positive proof of *Pblegon's* words, such as very rarely attends any Fragment of Antiquity, mere conjectures, surmises, and suspicions are of no sort of weight and significancy. For if these were allowed to overthrow such clear and explicit Authorities, the Criticks would find it very difficult, if not utterly impossible, to secure the Text of any antient Author from cavil and exception.

IV.

HAVING said thus much by way of Preliminary Remark, I come now to consider what Dr. Sykes has objected to our present reading of *Pblegon*. And here one would naturally expect to see our quotations of *Pblegon* confronted with others as full and express, bearing plainly very different Years or Olympiads, and of much superior Authority. But natural as it is to expect something of this kind, Dr. Sykes intends no such thing; his evidence is chiefly of the presumptive and conjectural kind, not positive and direct; and his Authors say little themselves, but are taught to speak by his sagacious Interpretations of them.

Dr. Sykesⁿ begins with producing *Julius Africanus*, who in a Fragment of his preserv'd

(n) Dissertat. p. 12.

by Syncellus speaks thus. Phlegon tells us, that in the Reign of Tiberius Cæsar, (at full Moon) there was a total Eclipse of the Sun from the sixth hour (to the ninth.) 'Tis plain he speaks of this^o (of the darkness at the Passion.) The Reader, I dare say, does not discern immediately, how Julius Africanus here is repugnant with Eusebius and the others above. Africanus says, Phlegon tells us of a total Eclipse in the Reign of Tiberius, and Phlegon in Eusebius says the same. Africanus mentions no particular year of Tiberius's Reign or Olympiad, therefore Africanus says nothing against the 4th year of Olymp. 202. in Eusebius. But still Africanus is against Eusebius, for as the Doctor argues^p, tho' Africanus has not named the year, yet by his application of Phlegon's Eclipse to the death of Christ, 'tis plain he supposed it to be in the same year. And if^q Phlegon's Eclipse was the same time of the year, that Africanus conceiv'd the death of Christ to be in, 'tis evident, he must suppose it to have been in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, i. e. it must have been not in the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad, but in the 4th year of the 201st. So that it seems Africanus does certainly contradict Eusebius, tho' not in express words, yet by a necessary consequence. In the same manner had

(o) Φλέγων ἱστορεῖ ἐπὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐν Παντολήνῳ ἔκλειψιν ἡλίου ἡμερῶν τελέειαν ἀπὸ ὥρας ἑκτῆς μέχρις ἑνάτης. Δῆλον ὡς πύττω, African. ap. Syncell. p. 322.

(p) Differt. p. 15.

(q) Ibid. p. 17.

the Learned *Basnage*^r argued upon this Subject. But really to me both Dr. Sykes and *Basnage* seem to have drawn conclusions, which are very illogical and precarious. For if any other good reasons can be assigned of this application of *Pblegon* by *Africanus*, besides that which the Doctor has given, then his cannot be prov'd to be the only true and necessary one, and it will not, I think, appear indisputable from thence, that *Africanus*'s reading of *Pblegon* was different from that of *Eusebius*. Now I say, and may reasonably suppose, that *Africanus* might apply *Pblegon* in this manner, either by mistake, for want of comparing critically the Olympiads with the years of *Tiberius*: Or because he might imagine that *Pblegon* himself was mistaken in the year, as living so long after the time. It was therefore judiciously urged against Dr. S. by the Author of the Letterⁱ, that *the whole weight of this Argument or rather Conjecture rests upon the supposed accuracy of those Fathers*; whereas they might easily have fallen into mistake, if in this case they made no nice Chronological comparison betwixt the years of the Olympiads and those of *Tiberius*'s Reign. Which, says he addressing himself particular to Dr. Sykes, *cannot surely seem strange to you, who are so ready, whenever it serves your turn, to give up the accuracy as well as honesty of*

(r) *Basnag. Annal. Politic. Ecclesiast. Tom. I. p. 245, 248.*

(i) *Letter to Dr. Sykes. p. 21, 22.*

these pious Authors. It is indeed a most fallacious and dangerous rule in Criticism, to correct the Text of Writers by a Reader's application of it; and that against the Authority of Manuscripts, and the plainest quotations. For then every Blunder and Hallucination of a Reader, whatever be the cause of it, whether Inadvertency, Forgetfulness, or Misapprehension, will furnish out a new Text, and the genuine will be utterly lost in a Monstrous variety of glosses and corruptions. But to shew the weakness and extravagancy of such sort of reasoning, let us only try it on some other Books, and see how it will hold in them. *Josephus*, says *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon*^t, relates, that *about the time* of Christ's *Passion* the Jewish Priests upon the day of Pentecost heard voices crying out from the innermost part of the Temple, *Let us depart hence*. Therefore to argue in Dr. Syke's way, all the present Editions of *Josephus* are very faulty and ought to be corrected; for they place this Story in the last destruction of *Jerusalem*, thirty years at least after the *Passion*. Again. Many ancient Writers fix the *Passion* of Christ upon Scripture Authority in the 15th of *Tiberius*. Therefore they could not have read in St. *John*

(t) Κατὰ τὰς αὐτὰς δὲ χρόνους ἸΩΣΗΠΟΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΕΙ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Πεντηκοστής, κινήσεως καὶ κλύου ἱερῆς ἀνπλαυδάνου πρώτον, ἔπειτα φωνῆς ἀδρόας ἡδὲν ἀκούσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτοῖς ῥήματα εἰπέσης, Μεταβαίνωμεν ὑμῖν. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 188. Ed. Scal.

(u) Josephus Bell. Jud. Lib. 6. cap. V. Ed. Haverc.

such a number of Passovers after the Baptism, as we do at present; and consequently these 3 or 4 Passovers must be judged to be mere corruptions and late interpolations of that Gospel. Such conclusions as these, I hope, Dr. Sykes himself would not be willing to allow; and yet these and many others of the same kind would be just and irrefragable, if Dr. Sykes's Argument from *Africanus* must be admitted as very sound and indisputable. Indeed if this sort of *Critique* were to prevail universally in the Learned World, wretched and lamentable would be the fate of antient *Greek* and *Latin* Books. And such it had been at the first Restoration of Letters, if rules of this kind had been followed then. But the *Stephens's*^w, the *Scaligers*^x, and *Casaubons*^y were wise enough to resolve misapplications of Authors into oversight and inaccuracy, to which all Men they knew were very subject, and the greatest among the Antients in particular. Nay even the *Moderns* themselves, and they of the first rank have been guilty of great mistakes in plainer cases than this of *Africanus*. *Joseph Scaliger* in his

(w) Henric. Steph. Præf. Observ. in *Ætchyl*.

(x) Jos. Scal. Prolegom. in Euseb. & Animadvers. in Euseb. p. 171, 172.

(y) If. Casaub. Animadvers. in Athen. Lib. IV. c. XIX. & alibi passim.

Familiaria veteribus *μνημονία ἀμαρτήματα* qualia non modo *Galenum*, *Maximum Tyrium*, atque alios, sed disertissimum etiam *Romuli Nepotum* admisisse advertit *Henricus Stephanus*, ac *Critici* passim. *Octav. Falconer. de Nummo Apamenfi.*

Animadversions^z on Eusebius reports from Julius Capitolinus, That Flavia Titiana the Wife of Pertinax bore the title of *Augusta*, in direct contradiction (as he thought) to Dion Cassius, who affirms, that he would neither allow the title of *Augusta* to his Wife, nor of *Cæsar* to his Son. Upon which he cries out, *Cui melius credetur, quam Dioni ipsi qui interfuit?* But 'tis Scaliger himself that sets Dion and Julius Capitolinus at variance, for want of considering carefully what Capitolinus had related. That Author, tho' he does indeed say, that these Titles were offer'd by the Roman Senate, yet in the very Life of Pertinax, to which Scaliger refers, tells us in clear and express words, that *Pertinax nec uxoris Augustæ appellationem recepit, & de Filio dixit, cum meruerit*. And so the great Isaac Casaubon^b very rightly understood him. Is not this now as strange a mistake, as that which Africanus is supposed to have committed? Once more. The same Scaliger^c in his Greek *Ολυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴν* quotes the words of a Scholiast on Pindar, to shew that the custom of running at the Olympick Games with a Chariot drawn by Mules was

(z) Jos. Scalig. in Euseb. p. 208.

(a) Jul. Capitolin. Vit. Pertinac. Tom. I. Histor. August. p. 342. Ed. Var

(b) Decreto Senatûs Augusta est appellata; sed eum honorem ab ea recipi noluit Pertinax, ut mox subjicitur, & pluribus Dio. Casaub. Annot. in Vit. Pertinac. c. 5.

(c) Scalig. ad Olymp. LXXIX.

left off about Olymp. 79. Whereas that Scholiast says^d expressly in words at length, that it was left off about Olymp. 89. Here now is a difference of just ten olympiads between *Scaliger* and his Author the Scholiast. And what must be done in this case? Must we change the common reading of the Scholiast ὀγδοηκοστήν into ἑβδόμεκοστήν to compliment *Scaliger*? Dr. *Bentley*^e was quite of another opinion, and pronounces the great *Scaliger* careless in his application of the Scholiast, nay gives us other instances of such misquotations in him, and tells us, that such oversights are not infrequent in that Collection of his. In truth, such oversights, as *Valesius*^g well observed, are discoverable in Men of the greatest Learning; and there is too much reason for saying with *Isaac Vossius*^h, *Vide quanti errores à magnis sæpe committuntur Viris!*

Thus then may we account for *Africanus*'s application of *Phlegon* from mere inadvertency and inaccuracy; and this might happen the more

(d) Εἰς τριμῆνον ἵπποις ἀγωνίζεσθαι, Ἀσάνδιαστος (Bentleio Θεσσαλίας πε) ἐπετήδυνσε καὶ ἡμιόνοις ἀγωνίζεσθαι. Χρόνος δὲ πε οὐ μακρὸς, ἀλλὰ δίκαιος (Bentl. δωδεκαετής) πῦτε διελυπε. Διελύθη γὰρ αὖτις τῇ ΟΓΔΟΗΚΟΣΤΗΝ ἐν ἅτῃ Ολύμπιαδα. Schol. in Pindar. Olymp. V.

(e) Dr. *Bentley*'s Dissertat. upon Phalaris. p. 196.

(f) See ibid. p. 215, 283.

(g) Hujusmodi errata obrepere plerumque solent etiam Doctissimis Hominibus, non tam memoriæ vitio, quàm per imprudentiam, dum minimè advertunt quæ dicuntur. Henric. Vales. in Ammian. Marcell. Lib. 23. c. 1.

(h) If. Voss. Observat. in Catull. p. 82.

easily, as the case it self gave room for a slip in *Africanus*. The coincidence of the Olympiads with the years of *Tiberius* could not be adjusted exactly, without much care and nice calculations. Several circumstances were to be consider'd and compar'd together, before the one could be made a plain Index to the other. And a casual omission of any one of these might make a difference in the account of 3 or 4 years. So that the supposition of an error here is not at all unreasonable.

BUT perhaps after all, *Africanus* himself might not be guilty of any negligence and oversight; he might discern well enough the disagreement in time between *Phlegon's* Eclipse, and the darkness at the Passion, but might attribute it to some mistake in *Phlegon* or his Author. He might judge from the *circumstances* of that Eclipse, that it really was the same with the other darkness, but might imagine that *Phlegon* or his Author had placed it in the wrong year. And to shew that this second solution of the matter is no more improbable than the former, I will give a clear Instance of it from another Writer in this very case about *Phlegon*. The Author of the *Historia Miscella* places the Passion in the 17th (in one MS. of *Canisius* 18th) year of *Tiberius*, and yet he applies *Phlegon's* Eclipse of Olymp. 202. 4. and those of other *Greek* Writers to the darkness at the Passion, declaring moreover, that he
makes

makes this application of them, *notwithstanding they relate such events as happening in the 19th year of Tiberius, Quamquam nonodecimo anno Tiberii hæc facta referuntur*ⁱ. Now why might not *Africanus* take the same liberty in his application of *Pblegon*, as this *Latin Historian* does; The latter, 'tis plain, neglected the Chronological Characters of *Pblegon* and the other *Greeks*, and why is it impossible, that *Africanus* should do so too?

THESE suppositions will still appear more easy and probable, if it be consider'd farther, that the difference between *Africanus* and *Pblegon* with respect to the Olympiads is not really so great as Dr. Sykes would perswade us. For *Africanus* placed the Passion of Christ in the second year of Ol. 202, not in the fourth year of Ol. 201; as Dr. Sykes had represented him. This is evident from *Africanus's* own words in *Eusebius*^k, *Jerome*^l, and *Syncellus*^m, who all agree in expressing the same year. So that the difference between the two Writers in the Olympiads is only 2 not 4 years. If it be re-

(i) Histor. Miscel Lib. VII. p. 225. ed 1603.

(k) Επὶ τῷ τῷ χρόνῳ, ὃς ἦν Ὀλυμπιάδης διακοσιοῆς ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑΣ ἔτος ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΝ, Τιβερίου δὲ Καίσαρος ἡγεμονίας ἔτος ΕΚΚΑΙΔΕΚΑΤΟΝ. κ. τ. λ. African. ap. Euseb. Dem. Evang. Lib. VIII. p. 390

(l) Usque ad ducentessimam secundam Olympiadem, & secundum ejusdem Olympiadis annum, Tiberii Caesaris annum quintum decimum &c. Id. ap Hieron. Comm. in Dan. cap. IX.

(m) African. ap Syncell. p 323.

plied, as Dr. Sykes has suggested ⁿ, that *Africanus* placed the Passion in the 15th of *Tiberius*, and consequently in the 1st of Ol. 202. I answer, that this is neither certain, nor very material. It is not certain, because tho' *Jerom* in a Passage of *Africanus* has *annum Tiberii Cæsaris quintum decimum*, yet *Eusebius* ^o before him and *Syncellus* ^p after him have both ἐτ' & ἐχρησάμενον at length. And if it be certain according to Dr. Sykes ^q, that *Africanus* was of opinion, that Christ Preached one year after his Baptism; it must be certain, that *Eusebius's* reading of *Africanus* is the true one. For as Christ was Baptized in the Spring not long before the Jewish Passover in the 15th of *Tiberius*, one year more of his publick Ministry will bring this Passion into the next Spring, and the 16th of *Tiberius*.

BUT neither is this objection very material. For *Africanus* might place the 15th of *Tiberius* in Ol. 202. 2. tho' other Chronologers may fix it to Ol. 202. 1. or 201. 4. It is manifest, that antient Authors differ very much, in adjusting the Olympiads, to the Reigns of the *Ptolemies*, *Seleucidæ*, Roman Emperors, &c. and therefore *Africanus* in adjusting the *Olympiads* to the years of *Tiberius* might have a pe-

(n) Dissertat. p. 17.

(o) Ubi supra.

(p) Ubi supra.

(q) Dissert. p. 17.

cular way of reckoning too *. Besides with regard to *Pblegon*, the only Chronological Character of his Eclipse was the 4th year of Ol. 202. He had not mentioned the particular year of *Tiberius*, in which it happened; and therefore *Africanus* in his application of *Pblegon* might only regard the *Olympiad* to which he fixed it.

FROM what has been said then, I hope, it is sufficiently clear, that Dr. Sykes's argument drawn from *Africanus* against the present reading of *Pblegon*, is very far from being conclusive. We have seen, that *Africanus* did not place the Crucifixion of our Saviour in Ol. 201. 4. but in Ol. 202. 2. And if he had done so, he might notwithstanding that have read in *Pblegon* Ol. 202. 4. and apply his Eclipse to the darkness at the Passion.

NOTHING now remains to be explained in *Africanus*, but his loose and irregular Representation of *Pblegon*'s words. He seems at first sight to intimate in the Passage cited above that *Pblegon* had mentioned the full Moon (*Πανσελήνῳ*) as the particular time of his Eclipse and had lengthned out the duration of it from

* I am not ignorant that two very Learned Men, Pagi (Critica in Baron. Tom. 1. p. 27.) and Bauldri, (Annotat. in Lactant. de Mort. Persec. p. 22.) have asserted, that *Africanus* in his supputation of the Olympiads outruns the common way of reckoning them 2 years, and that constantly. But I freely acknowledge, that I am not convinced of the truth of this Hypothesis, and I think, were this a proper place, I could disprove it from *Africanus* himself.

the sixth hour to the ninth. Now is it plain from Eusebius and others, who give us the very words of Pblegon himself, that Pblegon said nothing of the full Moon, or the ninth hour. The Question therefore is, how any such words should appear in Africanus. Mr. Whiston¹ suspects, that they are later interpolations, crept out of the Margin into the Text, and not the words of Africanus himself. The conjecture, I must own, is not without grounds and may be reasonably admitted notwithstanding the violent remonstrances of Dr. Sykes against it. For it seems to me a little strange, that Eusebius, who was so well acquainted with the works of Africanus, should not take the least notice of so remarkable an expression as *ὁ Πανσελήνας*, if it had been extant at that time in Africanus, and represented by him as the words of Pblegon. Neither are the MS. of Syncellus, upon which Dr. Sykes so vehemently insists², of such overruling Authority, as to silence and overthrow all conjectures of this kind. For corruptions might have crept into the Copies of Africanus, before Syncellus himself wrote his Chronicon, the distance between these two writers being no less than six hundred years. However I must confess, that all this is little more than a private conjecture,

(1) Testimony of Pblegon Vindicated. p. 29.

(2) Def. p. 20, 22.

which I would not insist upon as evident proof.

BUT if this solution of the difficulty does not please Dr. Sykes, the Author of the *Letter* will furnish us with another. He thinks, that *Africanus*, who does not pretend to give an exact Copy of Phlegon's words, but speaks from memory only, finding the darkness at the Passion to have happened at full Moon, and being thoroughly perswaded, that Phlegon's Eclipse was the same the Evangelists describe, supposes that Phlegon said the Eclipse happened at full Moon, and lasted from the sixth to the ninth hour^u. This is both candid and ingenious; and shews less prejudice and partiality, than invidious insinuations, that *Africanus* with the other Men of the second and third Centuries had a scurvy trick of Lying for God's sake^w. For why must every little misquotation of the Antients be resolved immediately into Fraud and Dishonesty, when other more favourable Accounts may be given of them; Dr. Sykes has no proof for his suggestion against *Africanus*; where then is the charity of blasting his Credit without any? The very turn and form of *Africanus's* expression gives us room to imagine, that he quoted Phlegon by memory only, and perhaps many years after he had read the Passage of Phlegon. And such misquotations of Authors are frequently

(u) *Letter to Dr. Sykes*. 8, 25.

(w) Dr. Sykes's *Def.* p. 21.

to be seen in the best antient Writers, and are attributed by Men of candour and judgment to inaccuracy and forgetfulness^x.

BUT to make as compleat an Apology for *Africanus* as I can, I would offer one consideration more in his favour, which is this; The words *ἐν Περσιλύνῳ* and *μέχρις ὀνάτης* might be inserted by *Africanus* not as the words of *Phlegon* himself, but as his own interpretation of them. I will explain, what I mean, by putting the whole Passage in *English*, just as I suppose *Africanus* might intend it in the *Greek*. *Phlegon tells us that in the Reign of Tiberius Cæsar (at full Moon) there was a total Eclipse of the Sun from the sixth hour (to the ninth.)* Here now by the difference of Character, and the Brackets inclosing them, the words *at full Moon* and *to the ninth* are easily discerned to be *Africanus's* own, added to interpret *Phlegon*, as he understood him to mean. And such interpretative additions are to be seen every day in our *English* Books, and cannot well be mistaken. But antiently among the *Greeks*, though such insertions as these were very frequent in their writings, yet they were not so cautiously distinguished in the Manuscripts; which has occasioned abundance of mistakes among Learned Interpreters. This observation it may not be improper to illustrate by a few instances

(x). Vid. If. Casaub. in Athen. Lib. I. cap. XIII. Lib. II. cap. XX.

from Antiquity. *Eusebius* in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*^y quotes the following Passage from *Josephus*. Τὴν δὲ Βασιλείαν Ηρώδης παρὰ Ρωμαίων ἐσχευεσθῆς, οὐκ ἔπ' τῆς ἐκ τῆ Ἀσσυριαίου γένεως, ἔτι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ καλέμδοι Μακκαβαῖοι, καθίστησι ἀρχερεῖς, ἀλλὰ πῶς ἀσήμες καὶ μόνον ἐξ Εβραίων ὄντας πλὴν ἐνὸς Αιφροδέλ. κ. τ. λ. These words appear in *Eusebius*, as if they all belonged to the Jewish Historian, being introduced with Ἰωσήπος ὡς πῶς ἰστορεῖ, and continued in the same character and form without the least distinction. Notwithstanding which, there is one sentence ἔτι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ καλέμδοι Μακκαβαῖοι, inserted by *Eusebius* himself, as his own interpretation of the τῆ Ἀσσυριαίου γένεως in *Josephus*. And accordingly we find, that this sentence is wanting in all the present Copies of that Writer^z. Again. *Suidas* speaking of that old Greek Proverb, Κοινὰ τὰ τῷ Φίλῳ, says that *Menander* uses it in his Play called *Ἀδελφοί*; and then adds, ὃ δὲ πρὸς τὰ χρήματα ΛΕΓΩΝ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῆ νῦν καὶ τῆς φρονήσεως κοινωσίαν. Now here one might be apt to imagine from *Suidas*'s λέγων, that these last words were taken from the Poet *Menander*, and the excellent *Grotius*^a under this perswasion digested them into Iambics.

(y) Lib.^o VIII. p. 397.

(z) Vid. *Joseph. Antiq.* Lib. XX. cap. X. Ed. Haverc.

(a) *Grot. Excerpt.* p. 708.

τὰ τῷ φίλων κοῖν', ἢ μόνον τὰ χρήματα.
Καὶ νῦν δὲ καὶ φρονήσεως κοινωνία.

In which mistake he was followed afterwards by Mr. *Le Clerc*^b. But the acute *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*^c proved clearly enough, that τὴν τῷ νῦν καὶ τῆς φρονήσεως κοινωνίαν were not *Menander's* but *Suidas's* words, added by him to explain the Poet, as he understood him. For all that *Menander* had said, was κοινὰ ΠΑΝΤΑ τῷ φίλων to which *Martial*^d alludes in that verse,

Candide, κοινὰ φίλων, hæc sunt tua, Candide ΠΑΝΤΑ.

And *Terence*^e in these lines,

—*Vetus verbum hoc quidem est,
Communia esse amicorum inter se omnia.*

But the πάντα of *Menander* being a comprehensive term, *Suidas* interpreted it as extending to the νῦν and φρόνησις as well as τὰ χρήματα. A 3d instance of this kind^f is in *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, who cites a Poet after this manner. Ἡ παρὰ τῷ κωμικῷ ὀπιλογιστικὴ γυνὴ λέγει, τί δ' ἂν γυναῖκες φρόνιμον ἐργασαίμεθα, ἢ λαμπρὸν, αἱ χαρὴν εἰσενέμεναι, τῷ ἐλευθέρων γυναικῶν λυμηνόμεναι τῷ χαρῆς. οἴκων ἀνατροπὰς, καὶ γάμων ἐκτροπὰς, καὶ παίδων διαβολὰς ποιούμεναι. *The wise Woman in the comic Poet says, τί δ' ἂν δεῖ.*

(b) *Menand. & Philem. reliq. p. 2.*

(c) *Emendat. in Menand. & Philem. reliq. p. 2.*

(d) *Lib. II. Epig. XLIII.*

(e) *Terent. Adelph. V. 3.*

(f) *Clem. Alex. Pædag. Lib. III. p. 254. Ed. Potter.*

Upon reading this Passage who would not think, the whole was borrowed from the Poet? *Grotius*^g certainly thought so, and accordingly took the pains of casting it, as he did *Suidas* before, into these *Iambic* verses:

Τί δ' ἂν γυναῖκες Φρόνιμον ἐργασαίμεθα,
 Ἡ λαμπρον, αἱ καθήμεθ' ἐξανθισμέναι,
 Λυλαινόμηναι χαρακλήῃα τ' ἐλευθερῶν,
 Οἴων ἀνατροπὰς καὶ γάμων ἐτ' ἐκτροπὰς,
 Καὶ παιδίων διχβολὰς πεποιέμεναι;

But certain it is, that the third of these verses is no true *Iambic*, nor belongs to any Poet, but to *Clemens* himself, being his satirical exposition of the word ἐξανθισμέναι, signifying *painted*. The two first verses are still extant in *Aristophanes*^h, and the two last, I believe, were taken from *Antiphanes*. Our most Learned *Gataker*ⁱ indeed declar'd all but the two first to be mere prose, and the composition of the *Father* himself. But I own there appears to me something truly poetical in the turn and expression of the two last verses, which perswades me that they are the words of of some *comic* Poet; and none in my opinion is more likely to be the Author of them, than *Antiphanes*, who is immediately after produced by *Clemens*, as ridiculing these very fopperies and extravagancies of Women,

(g) Grot. Excerpt. p 907.

(h) Aristoph Lyfistrat v. 42.

(i) Gataker. Adversar. Posthum. cap. IX.

Τὸ αὐτὸ γάρ τοι ἔ' Ανφράης ὁ κωμικός ἐ' Μαλ-
θαῖ τὸ ἐταιρικὸν τ' γυναικῶν ἀποσκόπει.

IT would not be very difficult, to multiply instances of this kind from *Plutarch*, *Athenæus*, *Pollux*, *Suidas*, and several others; but this would carry me out into long and tedious digressions. Let it suffice therefore to observe in general, that the words of a quotation are frequently so blended and intermixed * with those of the Writer who quotes them, that they are often confounded one with another by very considerable Men. And this I have observed particularly to happen, where an Author is introduced, as *Pblegon* is by *Africanus*, with an ἰσοεῖ. From hence then it may seem probable enough, that ἐ' Πανσελήνῳ might be inserted by *Africanus*, as his own interpretation of *Pblegon's* μέγιστη τῶν ἐγγραφέντων πρὸς τὸν, which, you see, he entirely omitted in his citation of him, as being perhaps in his judgment tantamount to saying, that his Eclipse was not common and *natural*, but one that happened *at full Moon*. The Reader is now left at liberty to chuse whichever of these three accounts he likes best; and I hope, by this time, the objection from *Africanus* is effectually taken off, and may be fairly dismissed.

(*) Aliorum dicta scriptores tum sacri tum profani ita suis sæpenumerò intertexta exhibent, ut quid aliunde mutuatum, quid de suo adjectum, haud proclive sit internôsse; quod summos etiam Viros sæpenumerò sefellit. Gataker. Adversar. Posthum. cap. IX.

V.

THE next Writer, that Dr. Sykes^k raises up in opposition to *Eusebius* &c. is *Origen*, whom he seems to prize and caresses exceedingly, spending no less than fifteen Pages together, to set him out in his full Strength and brightest Colours. *Origen*, I confess, is a Writer of great Authority, and for whom I have as high an esteem, as, I believe, Dr. Sykes himself. But never sure was *Origen* so harmless an Adversary, as I shall prove him to be in the present dispute. The Reader is desired to remember, that the Point, which I have laboured all along, and that which is now the principal Point in dispute, is the true Reading of *Pblegon*. I maintain, that *Pblegon* placed his Eclipse in the 4th year of Ol. 202. Dr. S. allows, if that be true, *Pblegon's* Eclipse did relate to our Saviour's Passion; therefore what he is to shew, is, that *Pblegon* did not place his Eclipse in that year but some other. Let us now see, what *Origen's* testimony amounts to.

ORIGEN in a certain Discourse^l upon St. *Matthew*, of which there is now preserved only a *Latin* Translation, and that a very barbarous and obscure one, and composed by nobody knows who or when, has drop'd some

(k) Dissert. p. 19. — 34.

(l) Tractat. XXXV. in Matt. p. 199, 200. Ed. Basil.

particulars, which Dr. Sykes has mightily insisted on, but which seem to me as foreign and of as little consequence, as any thing imaginable. To make this clear to every Reader, I must correct that imperfect, erroneous, and obscure Representation of him, which Dr. Sykes has given us, and explain the whole Passage more minutely and particularly, than he has done.

ORIGEN first introduces some Enemies of the Gospel, as saying, *How can that be true according to the Text*, that there was darkness over all the Earth from the sixth hour to the ninth, *which*, say they, *no History ever mentions^m?* Which what? why such a *supernatural darkness as the Gospel relates*. This is what those objectors meant, that no *History* mentions such a *darkness*, with any particular notice of its being *preternatural*, and contrary to the common course of things. And therefore in the next words, they assert, that *there was nothing but a common Eclipse of the Sun at the time of Christ's Passionⁿ*. To which Origen answers very well^o,

(m) Quomodo secundum textum potest esse verum quod dicitur, *Facta sunt tenebra super omnem terram à sextâ horâ usque ad nonam*, quod factum nulla refert Historia? Ibid. p. 199.

(n) Dicunt, quia sicut solet fieri in Solis defectione, sic facta est tunc Defectio. Ibid.

(o) Sed defectio Solis, quæ secundum consuetudinem temporum ita currentium fieri solet, non in alio tempore fit, nisi, in conventu Solis & Lunæ, — In tempore autem quo passus est Christus, manifestum est quoniam conventus non erat Lunæ ad Solem, quoniam tempus erat paschale, quod consuetudinis est agere, quando Luna Solis plenitudinem habet. Ibid.

that the darkness at the Passion could not arise from a natural Eclipse, because the Moon was then full, and in opposition to the Sun. Here we may observe two faults committed by Dr. Sykes. 1st. His not stating distinctly^p this first objection of the Pagans, and informing the Reader, how far and in what respects, they asserted, that *no History* mentioned the darkness at the Passion. And 2d. his putting the Answer of Origen in the mouth of the Heathens. He (Origen) *makes* them, says Dr. S., *reason very truly, that this could not arise from any natural Eclipse.* Just the reverse. Origen would have made *them* talk nonsensically, if he had made *them reason* in this manner. For as they had just before asserted, that the darkness at the Passion was only a common Eclipse, how could they with any sense and consistency in the next Sentence, argue that it was not and could not be a common Eclipse? To go on. Origen after he had given his own Answer to these objectors, tells us, that some *Believers* made another sort of *Defence* against them. They urged, that as there were other preternatural events attending the Passion, *Rocks rent, Graves opened, and Earthquake &c.* so the *darkness* might reasonably be judged to be *prodigious, and preternatural*^q. To all which the

(p) Differtat. p. 19.

(q) Quia (l. Quidam) autem *credentium* volentes defensionem aliquam introducere contra hæc, ita dixerunt.

Pagans reply in defence of their former position, "*Suppose, that this defectio Solis was preternatural, and that it happened not long ago in the Reign of some Roman Prince, so that darknes were over all the Earth to the ninth hour, how comes it to pass, that no one of the Greeks, no one of any other Nation took any notice of this extraordinary event as happening at that time, especially those who have wrote Chronicles, and remarked every thing that appeared new and strange? How is it, that only your own Writers have taken notice of it? Phlegon indeed in his Chronicles has wrote of a darknes in the Reign of Tiberius Cæsar, but he has not signified that it happened at full Moon*". Now, before I consider, what Origen replies again to these Queries of the Pagans, I would observe, that what is said here by the Pagans of the Greek or any other *Historians*, does not

Cum constet cætera prodigia. quæ tunc facta sunt, non secundum consuetudinem facta fuisse, sed nova & admiranda: nam & velum Templi scissum est in duas partes, & terra contremuit, & petrae disruptæ sunt, & monumenta aperta sunt,— manifestum est quoniam & illa defectio Solis consequenter secundum cætera prodigia nova contra consuetudinem facta est. Ibid.

(r) Pone, quia extra consuetudinem facta est illa defectio Solis in tempore non antiquo, sub Principatu Romanorum, ita ut tenebræ fierent super omnem terram usque ad horam nonam; quomodo hoc factum tam mirabile nemo Græcorum, nemo Barbarorum factum conscripsit in tempore illo; maximè qui Chronica conscripserunt, & notaverunt sicubi tale aliquid novum factum est aliquando: sed soli hoc scripserunt vestri Autores? Et Phlegon quidem in Chronicis suis scripsit, in Principatu Tiberii Cæsaris factum, sed non significavit in lunâ plenâ hoc factum. Ibid.

prove

prove one tittle in reality against the reading of *Pblegon*, or *Thallus*, or any other Writer. They do not affirm, or intimate, that *Pblegon* did not speak of an Eclipse in the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad; nay they allow, that he did write of an *Eclipse in the Reign of Tiberius Cæsar*. But the silence of Historians which they mean, and upon which they ground their objection, is a silence as to the particular circumstances of the darkness, the extraordinary nature of it, the place, the week, and day upon which it happened. And finding that these particulars were not minutely specified by any Heathen Historians, they boldly denied, that such Historians confirmed any facts of the Gospel. Thus they evaded here the testimony of *Pblegon*, (which by the way appears from this very Passage to have been urged by the Christians before *Origen's* time) by saying, that *Pblegon* did indeed speak of a darkness in the Reign of *Tiberius*, but that he made no particular mention of the precise time, when it happened, whether it was at *full Moon* or not. Therefore they would not allow that the darkness of *Pblegon* was the darkness at the Passion. And thus were they ready to evade the testimony of *Thallus*, or any other *History* and *Chronicon*. This being premised, let us now see, what *Origen's* second Answer to his Adversaries will prove against us. *Origen* finding that the Heathen Historians were defective as to those particular
cir-

circumstances mentioned above, and sensible how difficult it was at that time to prove clearly their confirmation of the Gospel-History, chuses to wave their Authority, and answers the Query of the Pagans another way. " I am
 " of opinion, says he^f, that as the other Signs
 " which happened at his Passion, were only
 " done in *Jerusalem*, so likewise that the dark-
 " ness was only over all the Land of *Judea*.
 " As to the particulars, which I say, hap-
 " pened only in *Jerusalem*, they are these.
 " The veil of the Temple was rent, the
 " Earth quaked, the Rocks were rent, the
 " Monuments were opened. For out of *Ju-*
 " *dea* the Rocks were not rent, nor were any
 " Monuments opened, but those that were in *Je-*

(f) Arbitror ergo, sicut cætera signa, quæ facta sunt in Passione ipsius, in Hierusalem tantummodo facta sunt, sic & tenebræ tantummodo super omnem terram Judæam sunt factæ usque ad horam nonam. Quæ autem dico in Hierusalem tantummodo facta, hæc sunt, quod velum Templi scissum est, quod terra contremuit, quod petreæ disruptæ sunt, quod monumenta aperta sunt. Nec enim extra Judæam petreæ disruptæ sunt. Nec monumenta aperta sunt alia nisi ea tantum quæ in Hierusalem erant, aut forte in terrâ Judæâ. Nec alia, terra tremuit tunc, nisi terra Hierusalem. Nec enim refertur alicubi, quod omne elementum tremuerit *in tempore illo*, ut sentirent v. g. qui in Ethiopiâ erant, & in Indiâ, & in Scythiâ. Quod si factum fuisset, sine dubio inveniretur in Historicis aliquibus eorum, qui in Chronicis scripserunt nova aliqua facta. Sicut ergo quod dicitur: terra contremuit, refertur ad terram Jerusalem, aut si latius voluerit quis extendere, ad terram Judæam; sic & tenebræ factæ sunt ab horâ sextâ usque ad nonam super omnem terram, intellige quod super omnem terram Judæam sunt factæ, aut certè super Hierusalem tantum. Ibid.

" *rusalem*

“ *rusalem*, or at most in the Land of *Judea*:
 “ nor was there any Earthquake elsewhere,
 “ except that in *Jerusalem*: for we have no
 “ account any where, that the whole Earth
 “ was shook at that time, e. g. so that those
 “ who were in *Æthiopia*, and those who were
 “ in *India* and in *Scythia* felt it. Which if it
 “ had happened, without doubt it would be
 “ found in some of *their* accounts of things,
 “ who have related unusual facts in their Chro-
 “ nicles. As therefore, when tis said, the
 “ Earth quaked, this relates to the Earth at
 “ *Jerusalem*, or if any one would extend it
 “ farther to the Land of *Judea*; so likewise
 “ when ’tis said, there was darkness over all
 “ the Earth from the sixth hour to the ninth,
 “ understand, that it was over all the Land of
 “ *Judea*; or upon *Jerusalem* alone. These
 were *Origen*’s sentiments at that time, and if
 that will be any satisfaction to *Dr. Sykes*, I am
 willing to allow, that *Origen* then did not think
 or did not know, that any *Greek* or *Barbarian*
 had mentioned any thing of the darkness at
 the Passion. But I desire him to remember,
 that this proves nothing against the testimony of
Pblegon or *Tballus* or any other. *Origen* might
 have seen *Pblegon*, he might have read in him
 the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad, and yet de-
 clined insisting on his testimony against the Pa-
 gans for more reasons than one. 1st. Because
 the year of *Pblegon*’s Eclipse was different from
 that,

that, in which most of the Christians and himself in particular placed the Passion of Christ. Therefore he might apprehend it something difficult, to reconcile the one with the other. 2d. *Phlegon* had not noted the particular time of the Year, and day of the Month, when his *Eclipse* happened, and therefore being not able to prove backwards by Astronomy, that no total Eclipse of the Sun could happen naturally that year, he could not convince a scrupulous Pagan, that his Eclipse must have been preternatural, and the same with the darkness at the Passion.

HOWEVER, let him say what he will in this place, he destroys the force of it entirely, by what he declared afterwards in another part of his Works. In his Books against *Celsus*, which are certainly genuine, still extant in the original Greek, and disputed by no one, he expressly appeals to our testimony of *Phlegon*. There he asserts roundly, that, *Concerning the Eclipse in Tiberius Cæsar's Reign, in whose time Jesus was crucified, and concerning the great Earthquakes, Phlegon wrote in the 13th Book, I think, of his Chronicles*. Here he plainly retracts, what he had said before in his discourses on *St. Matthew*, and as this work of his against

(1) Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐκλείψεως καὶ τοῦ σεισμοῦ ἐκλεψάως, ὃ βασιλεύοντος ἔ
 ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰσχυρῶς αὐτῶν καὶ μεγάλων τότε γινομένων σεισμῶν τῆς γῆς
 ἀνέγραφεν καὶ φλέγων ἐν καὶ τεσσαρδεκάτῳ, εἰς τὴν τῶν χρονικῶν.
 Orig. cont. Cels. Lib. 2. p. 80. Vid. p. 96.

Celsus is allowed to be the most exact and finished piece he ever wrote, by this we ought in reason to be determined in our judgment of *Origen*. Dr. *Sykes* was aware, that something might be urged against him from hence, therefore he interposed very early some caveats and exceptions against it. *If it be said*, says he, *that he mentions his (Phlegon's) Authority in his Books against Celsus, 'tis true. But in what manner does he do it? Is it like one that was convinced of its pertinence*"? Really I cannot but think so, for to what purpose else did he cite him? He positively asserts that *Phlegon wrote concerning the Eclipse in Tiberius Cæsar's Reign*, which he plainly understood to be the darkness at the Passion. Indeed he speaks only in generals, because that was not the place to prove distinctly the particulars, *Phlegon* coming in by the bye; and he was not willing to interrupt the thread of his Argument against *Celsus* by a long and foreign digression. The Dr. goes on, *Origen could not say nor does he say, that Phlegon expressly spoke of the same darkness and same Earthquake, which was at the time of Christ's Death.* It is very true; *Origen* does not say so much *totidem verbis*, but he either means that, or nothing. And tho' what he says does not prove, that the darkness which *Phlegon* mentions, was actually the darkness which happened at Christ's Death, yet it proves

(u) Dissertat. p. 28.

that *Origen thought* they were both the same ; and this is all, which I contend for at present. But, *after all, how does he here make the best of Phlegon's testimony?* Why, he expresses himself in the very loosest manner possible^w. Mere trifling! The reason of it is, because he did not intend in that place to *make the best of it*. He speaks of it only in passing, and expresses himself here in the *loosest* manner, because that was not the time for full explications. Surely a Man is not obliged, whenever he touches upon a point, to write, a Treatise professedly upon it. But *he cites him*, says Dr. Sykes, ^x *as telling of what happened about the time of Christ's Death. Not asserting, that it was at that time, nor pretending any such thing.* Very strange indeed! Why must $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ τὸν χρόνον necessarily signify *about* the time and not *at* the time? Is it not used very often in this sense by the best Greek Historians? And do not Ecclesiastical Writers use it often in the same sense? Why then may not *Origen* take the same liberty? But, if Dr. Sykes will not allow it, I hope he will be pleased to tell us, what Greek Preposition is more proper to express *at* the time. Sometimes I agree, $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ does express a latitude, and signifies *about*, but it does not always ; and to prove that it has such a sense in this Passage of *Origen*, is certainly incumbent on Dr. S. Another

(w) Dissertat. p. 29.

(x) Ibid. Defense. p. 25.

Remark upon the Greek Origen is, that *notwithstanding his profession that he had done all he could, yet he cited Phlegon so carelessly, that he did not give himself the trouble of looking into him or consulting his Book. This appears from his not knowing certainly in what Book of Phlegon's this Eclipse was mentioned.* “It is, says he, I “suppose, in the 13th Book of his Chronicles. Let him be as *careless* as you please in his citations of *Phlegon*, yet he certainly cites him, and by so doing destroys all Arguments that may be drawn from his *Latin* work to the contrary. But pray, good Doctor, where is his *profession*, that he had *done all he could*, with *Phlegon*? There are 'tis true, such words in the Greek as κατὰ τὸ δύνατον, but even a *careless* Reader might perceive on the first sight of the Passage^z, that they do not belong to the citation of *Phlegon*, but to Origen's Answer at large to *Celsus* about the darkness and Earthquake, which is just and strong. Origen only refers to *Phlegon*, he does not *cite* him at all properly speaking, that is, he does not pretend to produce his words, as thinking a reference to him at that time sufficient. Neither is it to be pronounced such an heinous instance of *carelessness* in Origen, or the least diminution of his Credit,

(y) Defense. p. 25.

(z) Οὕτως δὲ (Κελσὺς) πράττειν εἶναι καὶ τὸ σίσιμον καὶ τὸ σίτος. καὶ ὡς, ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟ ΔΥΝΑΤΟΝ, ἐν πῶς ἀνατίθω ἀπὸ λογισμῶν, παραδέμενοι τὸ Φλίγοντι. κ. τ. λ. L. 2. p 96.

that he hints some uncertainty as to the Book of *Pblegon's* Chronicles, where the Eclipse was recorded. For he might not at the time of writing have the Book in his possession, or it might be displaced so that he could not find it, either of which cases are very possible, and experienced by all Writers. So that he might quote *Pblegon* by memory, not to save *trouble* but from necessity; and as it happened, he quoted the right Book; which to me is an Argument, that *Origen* was not *careless* in reading, if he was in citing *Pblegon*, and that therefore his Reference to him, was not made at random, but after due consideration.

I have now done with *Origen*, and have endeavour'd to shew, that even admitting the *Latin* discourses upon St. *Matthew* to be a genuine and faithful translation of *Origen*, no objection of any weight can be drawn from thence against the present Text of *Pblegon*, as it stands in *Eusebius*, &c. Pass we on now to

III. ANOTHER Writer, *Joannes Philoponus*; who, it seems, is not only against us by inference and *innuendo* like the others, but *expressly* ^a *fixes the Passage of Pblegon to the second year of the 202d Olympiad*. This to me is the most surprizing assertion in the whole *Dissertation*; and what account or solution to give of it I cannot tell. *Philoponus* indeed, in

(a) *Dissertat.* p 55.

the present Edition of him, does in one place^b fix Phlegon's Eclipse to the *second* year of the 202d Olympiad. But in the very next page he fixes it twice^c to the *fourth* year of that Olympiad, and compares the Olympiads with the years of *Tiberius* in so full and exact a manner, as to shew very plainly, that the *fourth* year was the true year of Phlegon's Eclipse. The whole Passage of *Philoponus* is as follows. That Phlegon's Eclipse is no other, than that which happened at the crucifixion of our Lord Christ, — is proved from the history it self of *Tiberius Cæsar*. For Phlegon says, that he began his Reign in the 2d year of the hundred and ninety eighth Olympiad, and that the Eclipse happened in the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad. So that from the beginning of *Tiberius's* Reign to the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad, are collected near nineteen years, three of the hundred ninety eighth, and in the other four sixteen. — Now the nineteenth of the Reign of *Tiberius* was the year, in which the crucifixion of Christ happened, and the wonderful Eclipse of the Sun consequent upon it^d. Is it not as clear as

(b) Τέττα ἡ σέξτης, μᾶλλον δὲ τῇ νυκτὶς ταύτης καὶ φλεγων ἐν ταῖς Ολυμπιάσιν ἐμνήσθη. λέγει γὰρ, ὅτι τῷ ΔΕΥΤΕΡῳ ἔτει διακοσίου δι-
τῆρας Ολυμπιάδων ἐγένετο ἡλίου ἐκλειψίς μεγίστη ἥ (ὅση) ἐγνωσμένη
ποτέποτε. Καὶ νῦν ὥρα ἔκστη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρων ἐν οὐρανῷ
φανῆναι. Lib. 2. c. 21. p. 88.

(c) Τὴν δὲ ἐκλειψιν γεγενῆσθαι ἐν τῷ ΤΕΤΑΡΤῳ ἔτει τῇ διακοσίου δι-
τῆρας Ολυμπιάδων.

Εἰς τὸ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΝ ἔτος. p. 89.

(d) Οἷον δὲ τῇ ἐν τῷ σαυρῷ ἡ Δισκορίῃ Χρ. τοῦ γενηθέντος ἡλίου ἐκλει-
ψίς, καὶ ὅση ἐτέρας ἐμνήσθη καὶ Φλεγων. Πρῶτον μὲν δέ. — καὶ ἀπὸ
αὐτῆς

any thing of this kind can be, that *Phlegon's* Eclipse was according to *Philoponus* in the *fourth* year of the 202d Olympiad, and not the *second*? I leave the Reader to make the proper Cominent upon this Calculation, and take the freedom of asking *Dr. Sykes*, why he omitted this whole Passage of *Philoponus* in his first Dissertation. *If he did not give himself the trouble of looking into him, or consulting his Book*, I'm afraid, the charge of *carelessness*, which he brought against *Origen*, will fall upon himself. If he had seen and considered this Passage, and yet wilfully omitted it, I am equally in pain for his Candour and Ingenuity. But whatever were the reasons of *Dr. Sykes's* conduct in this affair, when *Mr. Whiston* produced this last Passage of *Philoponus* against him, he presently un-

αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς πρὸ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἱερίας δίδχινται, Βασιλεύει μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν Φίσι ὁ ΦΛΕΓΩΝ, τῷ διυτιῶν ἔτη τ' ἐκοτίσης ἐννεηκότης ὀγδὴς Ολυμπιάδης. Τὴν δὲ ἔκλειψιν γυνοίται ἐν τῷ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΩ ἔτει τ' ἐννεηκότης διυτίσας Ολυμπιάδης, ὡς συναγὰς ἀπὸ τ' ἀρχῆς τ' βασιλεύσαι Τιβερίου ἵως τ' ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΥ ἔτους τ' διακοσιότης διυτίσας Ολυμπιάδης ἐγγυς που ἔτη δέκα καὶ ἑννα, τρία μὲν τ' ἐκατίσης ἐννεηκότης ὀγδοῦς, τ' δὲ ἄλλων τεσσάρων δέκα καὶ ἑξ. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Λουκάς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ἰδρύσῃ. Τῷ γὰρ πῖπ εἰ δικάτω ἔτει τ' Τιβερίου Βασιλείας Φίσι, πὲ κήρυγμα Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστῆ γυνοίται, ἔξ οὗ πὲν ἀρχὴν τὸ τ' Σωτῆρος εἴληφε τὸ εὐαγγελικόν. Παρέτειναι δὲ οὐδ' εἰς ὅλας ποσάσας ἡμετέρας, ὡς Εὐσέβιος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τ' ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱερίας ἰδρύει, καὶ τ' ἀρχαιολογίας Ἰωσήπου τοῦτο συναγὰς. Ἀρξαμένων γὰρ ἐπὶ Ἀνατ' Ἀρχιερέως, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν τριῶν ἄλλων Ἀρχιερέων γυνομένων, (ἡμετέρας δὲ τ' ἀρχιερασύνης ἦν χεῖρ) εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τ' μετ' ἐκείνου ἡμετέρας καὶ ἡμετέρας πύρας εἴληφε, σωρωδότης χριστοῦ. Ἡ δὲ τὸ ἔτος ἐκείνο τ' Τιβερίου Καίσαρος βασιλείας ἡμετέρας εἰ δικάται, ἐν ᾧ ἡ στήριος τ' χριστοῦ γέγονε τοῦ χριστοῦ σωρωσις, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῇ πυραδὶς καὶ ἀσυνήτης τῇ φῶσει ἐκλείψις ἡλιακή. p. 89.

dertook to prove it of no significance. For says he^c, *I would principally observe, that in the place where Philoponus quotes Phlegon's own words, there he has it, in the second year of the 202d Olympiad. When he speaks twice of the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad, there he only gives us Phlegon's sense, and not the words of Phlegon himself.* Well, be it so. Let Philoponus in these latter Passages give us only the sense of Phlegon. Could he possibly give any other sense of the word *second* in Phlegon, but the *second*? Could he give us *four* as the sense of *two*? Yes to serve a turn, Dr. Sykes imagines, though not out of ignorance. For Philoponus, it seems, was for applying Phlegon's Eclipse to the death of Christ, as others had done before him; he was forcing Phlegon's testimony into his Service, contrary to the express words of Phlegon, which then lay before him, and so talk'd inconsistently^f.

TRULY Dr. Sykes has an excellent opinion of Philoponus, both as to sense and honesty. He supposes Philoponus in one Page to bring in Phlegon, as placing his Eclipse in the 2d. year of Olympiad 202. and in the next Page to place this very Eclipse of Phlegon without any Authority in the 4th year, and then to argue gravely upon it, that Phlegon's Eclipse is the same with the darkness at the crucifixion of

(c) Defense. p. 41.

(f) Defense. p. 42.

Christ. A very kind and charitable supposition! Thus would the good Doctor sacrifice poor *Philoponus* for a Knave and a Fool, to gratify his own humour, and support a darling Hypothesis. This is forcing Men into service with a witness, against all reason and equity. But the nature of the case will not allow it. No reasonable Man, that ever looked into *Philoponus*, can seriously doubt, that he read in *Pblegon* the 4th not the 2d year of Ol. 202. One would really be apt to imagine, that this suggestion of Dr. Sykes was owing to a slender acquaintance with the Character and Writings of *Philoponus*. He was a Man of great Parts, great Study, and great Learning^g; and had the name of *Philoponus* from his Diligence and Labours. Besides his Philosophical Comments upon *Aristotle*, which are numerous and much esteem'd, there are two Theological Pieces now extant, which are standing proofs of his Abilities; one is an Exposition upon the Mosaical History of the Creation in seven Books, (from whence the Passages abovementioned are extracted) and the other a confutation of *Proclus* the Philosopher, who maintain'd the Eternity of the World. Both these I have read, and I am fully satisfied from thence, that shuffling and selfcontradiction were practices much less known to *Joannes Philoponus*, than to some

(g) Vid. Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Lib. V. c. 37.

modern Writers. He had too much acumen and integrity to quote *δευτέρω* from *Phlegon* in one Page, and to argue upon *τετάρτῳ* in another. And if such a gross repugnancy did appear in the present Text of *Philoponus*, a candid and ingenuous Reader would rather have suspected some fault in his Text, than downright fraud and folly in the Author himself. Especially as the present Edition of *Philoponus* is very corrupt^h, as I could shew in a great number of instances. There is hardly a Chapter in the Book without gross depravations; and few there are more plain and obvious than this before us. I make no doubt, but τὰ δ' δευτέρῳ ἔτι was put by the Copyist or Editor for τὰ δ' ἔτι. Such mistakes in transcribing numerals are often committed; and the numeral δ' particularly is frequently confounded with the initial Letter of *δευτέρῳ*, and by that means *δευτέρῳ* in many other Books has been discover'd to be written instead of *τετάρτῳ*. How far Dr. Sykes will acquiesce in this Emendation, I cannot tell; but I am not apprehensive, that a majority of Criticks will dispute it.

VI.

NOTWITHSTANDING the plain Representation of *Phlegon's* words, which *Jerom* has gi-

(h) Non satis diligenter ubique in Græcis describendis versatum esse editorem testatus est Lambecius; qui ex eodem Codice novam hujus operis editionem daturum se promissit cum notis, in supplemento, quod meditabatur, Bibliothecæ Patrum. Fabric. ubi sup.

ven us above, yet, it seems, even *Jerom* himself overthrows that very Reading of *Pblegon*, which before he so plainly exhibited. For *Jerom*, says Dr. Sykesⁱ, *has actually fix'd the Passage of Phlegon to the 3d year of the 202d Olympiad, at the same time, that he gives us the words quarto anno in the 4th year.* For a clear proof of which, the Doctor lays before the Reader *Jerom's* Chronology in this point, just as it stands at present in *Scaliger's* Edition of his *Latin Chronicon*. But to this I reply, that *Jerom's* *quarto anno* is so far from losing any of its force and Authority by this suggestion, that it absolutely disproves the suggestion itself. For the *quarto anno* Ol. 202. are *Jerom's* own words, positive and express, certain and unquestionable; whereas the Doctor's suggestion, that he fixed the Passage of *Pblegon* in Ol. 202. 3. has no other foundation, than that disposition or correspondence of years and facts, which *Scaliger* gives us in his Edition of *Jerom's* Chronicon. According to this indeed, *Pblegon* is placed under the third year of Ol. 202, but I will be bold to assert, that any argument drawn from hence is very weak and inconsiderable. For 1st. It is plain, that *Jerom* here does nothing but translate *Eusebius*; now *Eusebius*, as *Scaliger* shews^k, and Dr. Sykes allows, places *Pblegon* in the 4th year of Ol. 202. How then

(i) Dissert. p. 49.

(k) Scal. Animadv. in Euseb. p. 170.

should *Jerom*, who according to Dr. Sykes is *se* near a translator^l, place him in the third of the same Olympiad? Is it likely, that *Jerom* in his translation of *Eusebius*, should represent *Eusebius* so different from himself? 2. *Arnaldus Pontacus*^m, who published the *Latin Chronicon* with much more care and accuracy than *Scaliger* from a great number of Manuscripts, informs us, that in some MSS. *Pblegon* is placed a year lower, in the 19th of *Tiberius*, or Ol. 202. 4. And 'tis very well known, and has been often observed by very Learned Men, *Valesius*ⁿ, *Baluzius*^o, *Dodwell*^p, and Dr. *Bentley*^q, that *Scaliger's* Edition of that *Chronicon* is frequently faulty as to the years, in which historical facts are ranged. So that *Jerom's* absurdity, as the Doctor styles it, in placing *Pblegon* under the third year of Ol. 202, and in translating *Pblegon* at the same time *quarto anno*, is not so manifest, as the Learned Doctor may imagine.

If it be said, that according to *Jerom*, our Saviour preached three years after the fifteenth of *Tiberius*^{*}, and consequently must place the Passion of Christ in the third year of Olymp. 202. I reply that *Eusebius*^r, whom *Jerom* tran-

(l) Dissert. p. 49.

(m) Pontac. Not. in Euseb. p. 551.

(n) Vales. Annotat. in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. I. cap. V.

(o) Baluz. in Lactant. Mort. Persecut. cap. VIII. XVII.

(p) Dodwell. Dissertat. in Iren. III. §. 2.

(q) Dr. Bentley's Dissertat. upon Phalaris. p. 67.

(*) Dissertat. p. 52.

(r) Chronic. Græc. p. 188.

states and follows, says the same thing, and yet he places the Passion in the 4th year of Ol. 202. and why might not *Jerom* do so too?

But in short, allowing, that *Jerom* himself did really fix the Passion in Olymp. 202. 3., yet still the *quarto anno* of *Pblegon* stands immovable. For we have seen above †, that the Author of the *Historia Miscella* fixed the Passion in the same year, and yet applies *Pblegon's* Eclipse to the darkneſs at the Passion, which he assures us himself, was placed by *Pblegon* in Ol. 202. 4. and the XIXth of *Tiberius*. Why then may not *Jerom* agree with *Pblegon's quarto anno*, as well as that *Latin* Historian? And why must *Jerom's Chronology* invalidate it so much, when the other's affects it so little? I can see no such disparity in the two cases, to make such a difference in Authority.

IV. Dr. *Sykes* for five or six Pages together makes some very feint attempts to set up *Eusebius* against *Pblegon*. He tells us of omissions and inaccuracies, which he sometimes is guilty of, that he *heaps together in one and the same year things which happened several years both before and after the year he is speaking of*. And then he assures us, that we *cannot be certain that Pblegon's Eclipse happened this year, merely because Eusebius has cited it under this year*ⁱ. But upon a little recollection finding that all this was

(†) See p. 31, 32.

(i) Dissertat p. 45, 46.

foreign to the point, that the mere words of *Eusebius* were nothing to the *Chronological Characters* of *Pblegon* himself, he drops contentedly this amusing digression as of no consequence; and therefore to save both the Reader and myself any needless trouble, I readily consent to drop it too.

HAVING now run thro' the several objections of *Dr. Sykes*, which are founded upon antient Authorities, it may not be amiss to make a short recapitulation of what has hitherto been said.

I have shewn then in the foregoing Pages, that all the dispute at present between *D. Sykes* and us concerning *Pblegon*, must turn upon the reading of *Pblegon's* words, and that this reading must be settled according to those rules of Criticism, and that kind of proof, which are generally made use of and allow'd in such cases. I have shewn moreover, that the common reading of *Pblegon* is supported by Authority and Evidence of this sort, as great as almost any Fragment of Antiquity can pretend to, and by much greater than falls to the share of most Fragments, which are yet receiv'd and uncontested by the Learned. I have also obviated the several objections and difficulties, which have been raised by *Dr. Sykes* from *Africanus*, *Origen*, *Phileponus* and *Jerom*; and am perswaded that none of them are strong enough to prove, that the year of *Pblegon's* Eclipse was
any

any other than the *fourth* of the 202d Olympiad. This being done, I might now very fairly take my leave of *Pblegon* and Dr. *Sykes*, having performed all, which even in the judgment of Dr. S. himself, was necessary towards finishing the dispute. But as there still remain some difficulties behind, which tho' not affecting immediately the Text of *Pblegon*, yet may discourage the application of it to the darkness at the Passion ;

I proceed in the next place to consider them in their order.

VII.

I. Dr. *Sykes* seems to doubt very much, whether *Pblegon's* ἐκλειψις can denote any other than a *real* and *natural* Eclipse. Indeed if it cannot, then he could not speak of the Eclipse at the Passion, which was certainly *preternatural*. But no substantial reason can be given, why the *Greek* word must be thus restrained. In its primary and original signification it certainly imports any sort of *defectus* ; and tho' it became a term in Astronomy, and was used to signify a *natural Eclipse* either of Sun or Moon, yet neither Astronomers nor Historians were debarred

(t) Est *Eclipsis* vox Græca, ab ἐκλείπω deficio, quæ *deliquium* aut *Defectionem* significat, unde ægri & moribundi, cum *deliquium* animi, & languor letalis eos corripit, in *Eclipsin* incidisse dicuntur. Keil Læction. Astronom. Lect. XI.

from applying it to such *preternatural Phænomena*, as nearly resembled a *natural Eclipse* in effect tho' not in the *cause*. For how should they express such *preternatural Phænomena* at all, but by words already in use? What new name should they give them, when they know not their nature and cause? The most proper word they could use to express such *Phænomena* is ἐκλειψις; for as they are supposed to be very like a *natural Eclipse*, no one word could express that likeness so well as ἐκλειψις. Σκότος or any other word would be low and jejune; very short and defective. So that necessity and propriety too would prompt them to use the other. And here I have two very excellent Judges of Language *Grotius* and *Huetius* concurring with me; whose Authority, I believe, may be laid in the balance with that of the Learned Dr. *Sykes*. The first says *, ἐκλείπειν *Sol dici possit, cum quovis modo deficit*. The latter †, *Quocunque modo Sol deficiat, ἐκλείπειν dici potest, & omnis defectus, sive ordinarius, sive extraordinarius, est ἐκλειψις*.

IF Dr. *Sykes* should ask me, but is not ἐκλείψις in *Pblegon* more naturally and easily understood of a *natural Eclipse*? I grant it. But the question at present is, whether it must necessarily be so understood. If not, if it may be understood of one that is *preternatural*, then in

(*) Grot. in Matt. XXVII. 45.

(†) Huet. Demonstr. Evang. Propos. III. p. 29. Ed. 6.

the present case it is no argument for altering the date of it. *But do any writers in fact*, says Dr. Sykes, *ever call a darkness extraordinary an Eclipse?* Perhaps not, because there might never be known before a *darkness extraordinary enough to be called so*. The *darkness* at the Passion might perhaps be the only one so nearly resembling an *Eclipse*, as to deserve the name. And, I hope, of such *preternatural darkness* Dr. Sykes does not expect many instances to be produced. Nay *one* besides this is more than can reasonably be demanded; for as there must be a *first time* for calling *preternatural Phænomena* by improper names; it might as well begin in this case as in the other.

HOWEVER to satisfy Dr. Sykes, I can produce some instances of such expressions both in *Greek* and *Latin Writers*. Dio^u says, that among other Prodigies which preceded *Augustus's Death*, there was a *total Eclipse of the Sun*, ὅτε γὰρ ἡλίου πᾶς ἐξέλιπε, And Jerom says, *Defectio Solis facta*. The verb ἐξέλιπε here without a case after it, is as proper an *Astronomical Term*, as ἐκλειψις. And yet it does not mean a natural *Eclipse*; for as Dr. Sykes^w acknowledges, no such total Eclipse happen'd at Rome within eight years of his Death. Wherefore Calvisius^x

^u Lib. 56. p. 589,

^w Defense p. 53.

^x Refert Dio etiam Eclipsin Solis accidisse ante mortem Augusti, ubi Sol totus obscuratus sit, quæ Eclipsis nullibi invenitur. Credibile videtur, quemadmodum Xerxe transeunte Hellespontum, Phænomenon in Sole accidit, quo lumen amisit, & quod cladem

ingenuously resolves this *Eclipse* of *Dio* into an extraordinary *Phænomenon*. To answer, that *Dio* and *Jerom* may both be mistaken, is trifling and groundless, without any Authority but fancy and conjecture. Again. *Servius*^r tells us, that at *Julius Cæsar*'s death there was a *Solis defectus* from the sixth hour till Night; which therefore could not be *natural*; and yet he expresses it by *defectus*, which among the *Latins*^r was the current term for an *Eclipse*, as *ἐκλειψις* was among the *Greeks*.

ANOTHER instance of this kind we have in the old and excellent *Scholiast* upon *Aristophanes*. That Author tells us^a, that when *Stratocles* was *Archon* Ol. LXXXVIII. 4. at the time that *Cleon* was chosen General by the *Athenians*, there happened an *Eclipse* of the Moon in the Month *Boedromion*, which answers to part of our *September* and *October*. Now it is certain, as Mr. *Dodwell*^b has shewn at large, that the day upon which this *Eclipse* is said to have happened, was the 30th of the Month *Boedromion*, called by the *Athenians* ἐν ἡμέρᾳ νεῖα, or the last day of the old and the first of the new Moon. How

Græciæ portendit, ita tale quid accidisse ante mortem Augusti. Opus Chronolog. p. 430.

y Constat occiso Cæsare in Senatu, pridie Iduum Martiarum Solis fuisse defectum, ab horâ sextâ usque ad noctem. In Georgic. I. v. 466. Vid. & Plin. Lib. 2. c. 30.

z Vid. Plin. Lib. 2. cap. VI. VII. VIII. IX. X. Ed. Hard.

a Ἐκλειψις ἐγένετο Σελήνης — ἐπὶ Στρατοκλῆος Βοηδρομιῶν Schol. in Aristoph. Nub. v. 584.

b Dodwell. de Cycl. Vet. p. 32. seq.

then

then could there happen any proper *Eclipse* of the Moon? Or how could the *Scholiast* suppose any such to happen? And yet, we see, he calls this *defectio* of the Moon an ἔκλειψις, and by this word interprets the verse in *Aristophanes*.

Ἡ Σελήνη δ' ἐξέλιπέ γε τὰς ὁδούς

The same *Scholiast*^c tells us, that at this very time (when *Cleon* was elected General) there was likewise an *Eclipse* of the Sun. What! a *natural* and *proper* *Eclipse* of both the *Sun* and the *Moon* at the same time? That's impossible. So knowing and diligent a Person, as this *Scholiast* appears to be, could never imagine such a paradox to be real and probable. But as the *Poet* intimates by these lines of his *Chorus* the *Clouds*,

— τὰς ὀφρῦς συνήγομεν,

Κάποιῶμεν δεινά.

That when *Cleon* was chosen General*, the weather was very cloudy, dark and tempestu-

^c Ἡλίου ἐγένετο κατὰ πᾶσι τόχλῳ ἔκλειψις Κλίωρος χειροποιουμένου. Id. ad v. 585.

* Mr. Dodwell (*Cycl. Vet.* p. 35.) and the great *Ezechiel Spanheim* (*Not. in loc.*) think, that *Aristophanes* here does not speak of *Cleon's* first expedition to *Pylus*, which was Ol. 88. 4. but his second into *Thrace*, Ol. 89. 3. But this is only a conjecture of theirs, and may be plainly disproved from *Aristophanes* himself. For these lines, in which he speaks of *Cleon*, were in the first Edition of the *Νεφίλων*, as the old *Scholiast* assures us. Ex τῶ πρώτων, says he, *Νεφίλων* ἐν πύλῳ. Now the πρώτων *Νεφίλων* were acted, when *Isarchus* was *Archon*, Ol. 89. 1. that is, two years before *Cleon* went into *Thrace*. How then could *Aristophanes* in Ol. 89. 1. speak of an expedition of *Cleon* into *Thrace* Ol. 89. 3?

ous, and as he humourously represents the Sun and Moon Eclipsed at this dismal season;

Ἡ Σελήνη δ' ἐξέλιπέ γε τὰς ὁδούς· ὁ δ' ἥλιος
τὴν θρυαλλίδ' εἰς ἑαυτὸν εὐθέως συνελχύσας
οὐ φανεῖν ἔφασκεν ὑμῖν.

So the Scholiast seems to mean no more by his ἐκλείψις than some remarkable *obscuratio* of the Sun and Moon, occasioned by Clouds and Storms. This I take to be the true meaning of the *Scholiast*; and this interpretation of him frees us at once from all those difficulties, which have given so much trouble to many learned Men†. For as to any *natural* Eclipse of the Sun or Moon at *that time*, all Writers agree there was none.

THESE few Authorities then may serve to shew, that as to the word ἐκλείψις no just exception lies against *Phlegon*.

VIII.

II. A second difficulty, which is artfully and speciously urged by Dr. S.^d is this. *That Phlegon's words expressly mention, or hint at nothing but an Eclipse of the Sun, nothing preternatural or extraordinary: now had he designed a preternatural Eclipse of the Sun at the time of full Moon,*

† Dodwell. de Cycl. Vet. p. 32. seq.

Samuel. Petit. Eclog. Chron. Lib. IV. cap. XII.

Ezechiel. Spanhem. in Aristoph. p. 285, 286. Ed. Kust.

d Dissertat. p. 65. Defens^o p. 10, 11.

Phlegon's omissions considered. 69

'tis scarce possible for him not to have taken notice of it. So that Phlegon's omission of such a circumstance, is a very strong argument, that he was not speaking of an Eclipse at the full Moon. How absurd it is to imagine, that an accurate Man, curious in his accounts of what passed, should barely take notice of the darkness of an Eclipse, and yet that he should not take any notice of the duration of the darkness for three hours, nor of its being at full Moon, nor in short of any thing preternatural, and more than ordinarily remarkable? That a Man so considerable for his abilities and accuracy in writing, should yet be so inaccurate, as to omit the only very remarkable circumstances in such events as he mentions, is highly improbable in itself. The difficulty is stated here in the Doctor's words at full length, that it might not lose any of it's force by an imperfect Epitome from me. And a difficulty it certainly is at first sight, which may happen to surprize and startle us excessively. But when we recollect one circumstance, which Dr. Sykes unaccountably forgot, perhaps the surprize and difficulty too may be something abated. Phlegon did not write his *Olympiads* at the time when this Eclipse happened, but at least an hundred years after; for he liv'd as I have shewn above, in the Emperor *Adrian's* time, was himself a *libertus* or *freedman* of the *Emperor*, and carried his Chronology down to the first year of *Olympiad*

Olympiad 229^o, which is full an hundred year after the death of Christ. Now as I apprehend it is not so much to be wondered, that *Pblegon* tho' a wise Man and an accurate Chronologer should omit many circumstances of an Eclipse which he never saw. He was forced to take his accounts of things, from Persons who might not be accurate Astronomers, nor exact observers of every circumstance. And therefore it is a little absurd in Dr. Sykes to compare, as he does the case of *Pblegon* with that of an *Historian* who should live at the very time of such an extraordinary Eclipse, to which I must add that the antient *Historians* and *Chronologers* were seldom or never so minute and particular in observations of this kind; they^e contented themselves very often with a bare mention of an *Eclipse*, without remarking the time or duration or any article of moment concerning it. And this even in cases, where something extraordinary and striking occurred; as may be seen in *Dio* and *Servius* quoted above. An accurate *Modern* might wonder, that neither of these two Writers should take the least notice of the place of the *Moon* at the time of their *Solar Eclipse*; and that one of them should not drop a syllable about the *duration, day, or hour*

^e Vid. Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. L. IV. c. XIII. p. 397, 399.

^f Defense p. 9, 10.

^g Vid. Epistol. Chronolog. Cl. Alphons. des Vignol. ad Harduin. p. 236. Ed. 1708.

Phlegon's omissions considered. 71

of his. Yet wonderful as this is, the fact is certain, that neither of them speak of a *natural* and *proper* Eclipse. And why might not the Author, whom *Phlegon* followed, be as little exact and particular? However to make some amends for his silence about the *Moon*, he tells us that this *Eclipse* † *was the greatest of any that had been known before*; which seems to me to be a plain intimation, that it was not a common and *natural* one. *Solar* Eclipses and those *total* had been known before^h, how therefore could this be the *greatest* of any known before in a *natural* way? Dr. Sykes replies, that *Phlegon* by *μεγίστη τῶν ἐγνωσμένων* *ὑπερτέρον*, and *Jerom* by *magna & excellens inter omnes*, may mean no more than a *very great and remarkable one*ⁱ. Which interpretation of *Phlegon* and *Jerom* is so remarkable, so *excellens inter omnes*, that I shall not say one word to disprove it. But perhaps, as Dr. Sykes replies again, *this Eclipse might be stiled the greatest of any known before, not as if there never was a greater in no part of the World, but that a greater had not been known by any body alive, or in Asia minor*^k. It is possible indeed, that it might be so; but as *Phlegon* says nothing of *Asia minor*, nor

† *Μεγίστη ἢ ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον.*

^h Vid. Petav. Doctrin. Tempor. Lib. 8.

ⁱ Def p. 67. Dissertat. p. 67.

^k Defense p. 68.

of any body alive, he need not submit to any such conjectural and precarious limitations.

ANOTHER remarkable character of *Pblegon's* Eclipse, is the great Earthquake, which he mentions as overthrowing a great part of the City *Nice* †. That this Earthquake accompanied the Eclipse, is evident enough from the Text of *Pblegon*; and Dr. *Sykes* himself seems willing to allow it. Now this is a circumstance very particular and extraordinary, not usual in other common Eclipses; between which and an Earthquake there is no visible connection in Nature, nor any observed before in History. This therefore as it serves to distinguish *Pblegon's* Eclipse from all others, so it seems to be a plain indication, that it was not exactly of the same nature with others. But one principal use of it is to shew, that *Pblegon's* Eclipse must be different from that of *Kepler's* in Ol. 202. 1. which he and Dr. *Sykes* would have to be the same; for no *History* no *Chronicon* ever mentions a syllable of an Earthquake attending that Eclipse. And for want of this circumstance beside other reasons, that Eclipse of *Kepler's* has no more relation to *Pblegon's*, than those recorded in *Thucydides*.

I cannot dismiss this article, without taking notice of a pleasant remark, which Dr. *Sykes*

† Σεισμός τε μέγας κατὰ Βιβυρίαν γινόμενος τὰ πολλὰ τῆς Νικαίας κατερέψατο.

1 Def. p. 67.

Phlegon's omissions considered. 73

makes upon these last words of *Phlegon*. If you will take these words rigidly, says he, the greatest of any known before, then this will prove too much. For when a thing was never known before, it is absurd to call it the most remarkable, or the greatest of any known before *. Which is nothing but quibble and sophism. For take but *Eclipse* out of its strict and rigid sense, and apply it, as it may be and is often applied, to any *defectus* of the Sun, and the little difficulty immediately vanishes. For any one *defectus* of the Sun may be very well compar'd with another, as to *effects* and *circumstances*, tho' they are not strictly of the same kind, and do not proceed from the same cause. Some may properly be said to be greater or less than others, in *duration* for instance, or *darkness* and the like, tho' all do not arise from a natural conjunction of Sun and Moon.

To this the Dr. adds an elegant piece of Criticism upon *Joannes Philoponus*. And therefore *Philoponus*, who reasons justly from this principle, that there never had been such an Eclipse, has added a negative particle to this citation, and reads it *μεγίστην τῶν ΟΥΚ ἐγνωσμένων* *μεγίστην*, designing to intimate that such an one had not been known before, tho' manifestly corrupting *Phlegon* †. Never sure was *Philoponus* so cruelly treated, as he has been now by Dr. Sykes. He is ist, represented as corrupting

* Def. p. 66.

† Ibid.

Phlegon by inserting words of his own, and next as putting nonsense upon him. For it seems to me to be little less than downright nonsense and contradiction, to say an *Eclipse was the greatest of any not known before*, i, e. to make a comparison with what never was. But all other Criticks are kinder to *Philoponus*, and pronounce *Ω* a corruption in the Copy, as it manifestly is. And perhaps *Dr. Sykes* himself would have used him better, if he had found him a real friend.

IX.

III. *The darkness at our Saviour's Passion was not over all the Universe, but was peculiar to Judea, and the Earthquake likewise was confined to Jerusalem, or at most to Judea, as Origen fully proves* Therefore *Phlegon* mentioning the effects of an Earthquake several hundred Miles off of Judea, plainly shews, that he speaks of a different Earthquake, and a different Eclipse from that darkness and Earthquake, that was peculiar to Judea^m. If the premises here were certainly true, and *Origen's* Authority in this case irrefragable, then the conclusion would likewise be very just and undeniable. But alas! very little foundation is there either for the one or the other. For

1st. THE sacred Evangelists do not confine the darkness or Earthquake to *Jerusalem* or *Judea*. The Phrase is ἐπὶ πᾶσαν γῆν, and ἐφ'

^m Differt. p. 65.

Darkness &c. not peculiar to Judea. 75

ὅλην γῆν, and those expressions are often used * to signify the whole World, or at least a much greater part of it than the Land of Judea; and how does it appear, that in this place they must necessarily be restrained?

The Learned Reland† speaks very well upon this head. *If any one is of opinion, that the Phrase πᾶσα γῆ may signify here only the Land of Judea, as it does Luke IV. 25. I shall not deny it. I confess, these words may be so understood. But let him on the other side grant to me, that the same words may signify the whole World, as they certainly do in those other Passages which I have produced from the New Testament. Let him farther consider, that the sense of the words is rather to be strengthened and enlarged, than to be weakened and restrained. And that besides here are many places opposed to but one; and that the three Evangelists all make use of the same expression, not*

* Luke XXI. 35. Rom. IX. 17. X. 18. Apocal. V. 6. XIII. 3.

Πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν hic ita sumendum arbitror, ut apud Lucam II. 1. πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, de Orbe Romano, aut certè de potissimâ ejus parte. Grot. in Matt. XXVII. 45. Vid. Wolfii Curæ Critic. & Philolog. Tom. I. p. 407

† Si quis existimet, uti Luc. IV. 25. πᾶσα ἡ γῆ notat solum terram Israeliticam, ita hic quoque notare posse, me non habebit repugnantem. Fateor ita posse accipi; verum & ipse mihi vicissim largiatur, eadem verba posse universum terrarum Orbem significare, uti in aliis istis locis ex novo Testamento à me productis verè significant. Consideret etiam vim vocum firmandam potius & augendam, quam labefactandam & minuendam esse: prætereà uni loco Luc. IV. 25. opponi multa alia: & non sine emphasi tres Evangelistas eodem loquendi modo usos. & πᾶσαν vel ὅλην adjecisse, qui aliàs eadem narrantes non ita iisdem verbis rem exprimere solent. Rel. Palæstin. Illust. Tom. I. cap. V.

without a particular Emphasis, adding *πᾶσα* and *ὅλη*, who at other times do not use to express the same thing in the same words. Thus far that excellent Writer, whose Judgment is of no small weight among the best Criticks and Divines.

2, As to *Origen*, he does indeed in his *Latin* work, which has been quoted above, confine both Eclipse and Earthquake to the Land of *Judea*. But how does he *fully* prove it, as *Dr. Sykes* would persuade us? Only by a private conjecture of his own, introduced by a modest *Arbitror*ⁿ; but not one tittle of *positive* Evidence does he bring to confirm it. All his proof is of the *negative* kind, founded on a *supposed* silence of *Pagan* Writers, as to such an *Universal* darkness and Earthquake. But if *Origen* had not collected accounts from *all* parts of the World, of an Earthquake and Eclipse at the time of our Saviour's Passion, does that *prove* *fully* or at all, that there were *no* accounts of such events in *any* part of the World at that time besides *Judea*? Is it necessary to suppose, that *Origen* at that time knew all that had been written about them? That he had seen all the Memoirs of what had passed in *India*, *Ethiopia*, *Scythia*, or in any other part of the World? Or is it impossible, that *Origen* might say this, because he could not easily apply such accounts

ⁿ *Arbitror* ergo; sicut cætera signa quæ facta sunt in Passione ipsius, in Hierusalem tantummodo facta sunt; sic & tenebræ tantummodo super omnem terram Judæam sunt factæ usque ad horam nonam. Tractat 35. in Matt.

Darkness &c. not peculiar to Judea. 77

to his own time of the Passion? *Tballus*, and *Pblegon*, and many others might be known to take notice of an extraordinary *Earthquake* and *Eclipse*; and yet *Origen* might imagine that they gave no accounts of such things as done at that time, i. e. at the Passion, as fixed by him. Surely such a bare conjecture of *Origen's*, so slightly supported, can never amount to a full proof, that the darkness and *Earthquake* at the Passion were peculiar to Judea. But so it happens, when Men have any darling Hypothesis. Every thing, that seems in the least to favour it, is a full proof; but all against it is good for nothing. I would ask the learned *Dr. Sykes*, why *Africanus* does not afford us as full proof, that the darkness and *Earthquake* were extended beyond Judea, as *Origen* does of the contrary? *Africanus* declares expressly, that there was a most dreadful darkness καὶ ὅλη τὴ κόσμῳ all over the World; that the Rocks were rent by an *Earthquake*, and many places in Judea, and in the other parts of the Earth were thrown down^o. Why is not this as convincing as *Origen's* arbitrator on the other side? *Africanus* was as antient as *Origen*, as knowing in History as *Origen*, and as far as I can find, as honest and careful. Why then is a bare conjecture of the one better proof than a positive assertion of the other, in a matter

ο καὶ ὅλη τὴ κόσμῳ σκότος ἐγένετο φεβεράται. Συσμῶ δὲ αἱ πέτραι διεσπένοντο, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τῆ Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῆ λοιπῆς γῆς κατήρυνον. Ap. Syncell. p. 322.

of

of fact? But to destroy effectually this *proof* of *Origen*, full as it appears to Dr. Sykes, I must once more appeal to the genuine *Origen*, who in his *Greek Work* against *Celsus*, as I have observed above, makes no scruple to acknowledge *Phlegon* as a witness both of the *Eclipse* and *great Earthquake* at the *Passion of Christ*. I now leave the Reader to judge, which *Origen* is of most Authority. He who appears only in a barbarous *Latin Translation*, which few value so much as Dr. Sykes, or *he* who is still extant in his original *Greek*. He who at one time offers a private opinion, or he who after more experience and consideration, thinks fit to retract it. He who proposes a conjecture, when he was younger and less knowing, or he who corrects it, when he was older and wiser.

To [which let me add, that the *Antients* in general extended the darkness and Earthquake of the *Passion* beyond *Judea*. It is a *mundi casus* with *Tertullian* ^q, with *Arnobius*, *universa mundi sunt elementa turbata*, with the Author of the *Recognitiones Clementis* probably older than both, *omnis ei (Christo) compassus est*

q Περὶ τῆ ἐπὶ Τιβερίῳ Καίσαρος ἐκλείψεως. — Καὶ περὶ ΜΕΓΑΛΩΝ ΣΕΙΣΜΩΝ τῆς γῆς ἀνέγραψε καὶ Φλεγών. Lib. II. p. 80.

q Apologet. c. 21. Eum *Mundi casum* relatum in archivis vestris habetis.

Cum *Mundi casum* vocat, satis cavit, ne *Judææ* peculiaris crederetur. Grot. in Matt. XXVII. 45.

f Arnob. Adv. Gent. L. i. p. 32.

Sun not obstructed by Clouds &c. 79

mundus, omnis mundus commotus^f. Now these Writers concurring with *Africanus* and the Greek *Origen* are, I think, considerable Evidence against any *Modern*, who shall please to assert without any Authority in *Antiquity*, that the darkness and Earthquake were both peculiar to Judea.

X.

IV. THE last difficulty that lies in our way, is this, That *Phlegon* not only calls his *Eclipse*, an *Eclipse of the Sun*, but he adds likewise, that the Stars appeared in Heaven. Now had he intended any darkness, but what arose from a true and proper *Eclipse*, he could not have added this, circumstance, because whatever obstructed the rays of the Sun, would much more obstruct the light of the Stars^f. Very true, if the rays of the Sun had been obstructed by Clouds. But how does D. S. know, that the Sun was obstructed in this manner? Mere suppositions, which have no other ground but fancy and private conjecture, are worth nothing, at least they can prove nothing. It is much more probable, that this darkness was the same in *Effect* with that of an *Eclipse*, tho' exceeding it in *Degree*. As it was *preternatural* in it self, so it was likely to be very far removed from an ordinary cause of dark-

^f Lib I. §. XLI.

^z Dissertat p. 67, 68.

80 CONCLUSION.

ness, such as *thick Clouds, Fogs &c.* This is the opinion of *Grotius**, and as I conceive one of equal weight and influence with that other of *Dr. Sykes*. So that for any thing, which *Dr. S.* can shew to the contrary, *Stars might appear in the Heavens* in the darkness at the Passion, as well as in a proper Eclipse.

CONCLUSION.

THESE are all the difficulties and objections, which, as far as I can find, are started by the Learned *Dr. Sykes* against our reading of *Pblegon*. And these being answered fully and carefully, and the Text of *Pblegon* sufficiently vindicated and established, as I hope, in the Pages preceding has been done in some measure, the consequence is, that all the suspicions of *Kepler*, together with his Solar Eclipse, must of course be given up as foreign and of no consequence. For what is an Eclipse in *Ol. 202. 1.* to that of *Pblegon* in the *fourth* year of the same *Olympiad*?

LET the calculations of the former Eclipse be made never so exact, let them shew to an instant at what time it began, how long it lasted, and where its Central Shadow passed, yet still, so long as the present Reading of *Pble-*

u Non interposita Lunâ, ut quæ tum plena esset, neque nube abductâ, sed modo quodam hominibus ignoto. Grot. ubi sup.

gon stands, it cannot be the same with *Pblegon's*, because it happened 4 years before it, and 4 years in this case are as good as forty. No one I suppose will venture to assert, or endeavour to prove it impossible *à priori*, that *Pblegon* should take any notice in his Chronicles of that extraordinary darkness, which happened at the Passion. If so, then the fact it self, *viz.* that *Pblegon* did actually take notice of it; if affirmed, must be proved from *Pblegon* himself, if denied, disproved from the same Author. This seems to me to be the surest, and most proper, and the most compendious way of deciding the Controversy; and for this reason, I have here confined myself to a strict examination of *Pblegon's* words. The issue of which is, that *Pblegon*, in my opinion, does manifestly appear to have fixed his Eclipse in Olympiad cc.ii. 4. and the direct consequence of this is, that as by Dr. Sykes's confession no *natural Eclipse* of the Sun did happen that year, *Pblegon's* Eclipse must be judged by all, who place the Passion of Christ in that year, to relate to the darkness at the Passion. This, I say must be the consequence, while the Reading of *Pblegon* is such, as I have here represented it. If it can fairly be shewn to be otherwise by better Evidence, I shall make no scruple to admit it, and shall agree with Dr. Sykes in dropping this *Testimony*.

POSTSCRIPT.

TERTULLIAN speaking to the Romans concerning our Saviour's Passion, has the following Passage. *Eodem momento dies media* (vulg. medium) *Orbem signante Sole subducta est. Deliquium utique putaverunt, qui id quoque super Christo prædicatum non scierunt; ratione non deprehensâ, negaverunt: & tamen eum mundi casum relatum in arcanis vestris habetis.* At the same instant (that our Saviour expired upon the Cross) the mid-day Light was withdrawn, the Sun sealing up his Orb, They truly, who did not know, that this event too was prophesied of Christ took this darkness for a (natural) Eclipse; and when they could not account for it (philosophically), they then denied the fact it self. And yet you have this fact related in your own (publick) Records*. A noble Appeal this to the Roman Præfides! But there is one Sentence in it, which appears to Dr. Sykes, as it stands at present, very difficult and hardly intelligible†. The difficulty with him is, how the same persons that at first thought it a natural Eclipse, should afterwards, when they were told it was a preternatural Eclipse, deny that there was any Eclipse at all, either natural or preternatural. For which reason, to make all easy

* Tertullian. Apolog. cap. xxi. See Haverc. in loc.

† Def. p. 43. Dissertat. p. 36, 37.

and good sense, the Doctor would insert a negative particle in it, and explains the whole in this manner. *Those*, says he, *who knew nothing of a Prophecy, that God designed to cause the Sun at that time to be Eclipsed, did (not) imagine, that that extraordinary darkness proceeded from an Eclipse, whereas in reality it did proceed from an Eclipse: They not considering nor imagining the reason of such a preternatural darkness, denied that there could be an Eclipse, contrary to known fact, and to what their own accounts bear witness to**. By which Interpretation and Criticism, the Doctor, as I apprehend, has quite destroyed the whole Thought and Sense of *Tertullian*, and made it ten times more obscure and perplexed than it was before. The Learned *Father* never intended to say, that these Adversaries did *not* imagine the darkness at the Passion to have been an *Eclipse*, but just the contrary, that at first they *did* imagine it to be so. And that this is the true meaning of *Tertullian*, is evident from that very Passage of *Origen*, which *Dr. Sykes* had produced before, and made so much noise with. For there we find the Pagans first asserting, that *at the time of Christ's Passion there was nothing but a common and natural Eclipse of the Sun*†. But when *Origen* had

* Def. p. 43, 44.

† Dicunt, quia sicut solet fieri in Solis defectione, sic facta est tunc Defectio. Orig. ub. sup.

See above p. 43. 45.

confuted this pretence, then they proceed to question the fact it self *; just like the Men in *Tertullian*, who at first called the darkness at the Passion a common Eclipse, *Deliquium utique putaverunt*; but when they found, this darkness could not be a common Eclipse, and was not to be accounted for upon principles of Philosophy, then rather than admit it to be preternatural and miraculous, they deny the fact it self, *ratione non deprehensâ, negaverunt*. Where is the difficulty in all this? And how could the Doctor perceive any, unless he was disposed for a *nodum in scirpo*? To me the words and sense are so clear, as to need no Comment, and exclude all mistake. The particle *non* indeed would make *Tertullian* very unintelligible, and the Dr.'s Paraphrase is beyond my comprehension. The Pagans, says the Doctor, *did not imagine the darkness to be an Eclipse*. What did they imagine it to be then? To be *preternatural*, or *nothing*? If the first, why did they deny the fact at all? If the latter, why did they not deny it in the first instance, without demurring upon it a while, till the *ratio* of it could not be found? Again. *In reality*, says the Doctor, *It did proceed from an Eclipse*. What a *natural Eclipse*? That's what no Christian *Father* would affirm. Or was it no *natural Eclipse*, but an extraordinary darkness? Then the Doctor's sentence in effect is this, that the *darkness* at the Passion

* See above p 45, 46.

proceeded from an extraordinary darkness, which, I think, is no very good sense; it being a little difficult to me to conceive, how a darkness can be said to proceed from a darkness. Once more. They not considering nor imagining the reason of such a preternatural darkness, denied that there could be an Eclipse, contrary to known fact, and to what their own accounts bear witness to. Here we have Jargon and Ambiguities again. For what is the meaning of Eclipse? The Doctor, who appears such an Enemy to an improper use of that word, should mean a natural Eclipse. And then, where is the wonder, in the Pagans denial of a natural Eclipse, if the darkness was really preternatural? but if his Eclipse means no more than an extraordinary darkness, why does he use that word to explain Tertullian, which is not in Tertullian himself, and serves only to obscure his sense? This is to shew, how widely Dr. Sykes has mistaken the true sense of Tertullian, and how far his Paraphrase is from clearing it. The Father's Text is plain and pure enough already, and wants no new insertions of negative particles; and that interpretation of it, which I have given above, has been admitted without any difficulty by Joseph Scaliger*, and the late very Learned Editor of the Apology, Sigebertus Havercamp†.

* Scal. Animadv. in Euseb. p. 171.

† Not. in loc.

I can-

I cannot conclude this head, without doing a piece of Justice to two great Men; *Grotius* and *Huetius*, upon whom Dr. Sykes on occasion of this Passage of *Tertullian* has thrown some very rude and injurious Aspersions. These excellent Writers in their quotations of *Tertullian* had omitted the words, *ratione non deprehensa negaverunt*. Upon which Dr. Sykes breaks out into this severe censure of them. Such careless citations of Authors can hardly be reconciled to Truth and Faithfulness; and shew how little trust is to be placed in quotations from any Writer, whilst they are not the subject of any Controversy; or else it shews, that these great Men saw the difficulty, and omitted what they did, because they could not well tell how to account for it*. Behold the sagacity of the Doctor in smelling and discovering a Plot! Moderns and Antients are, it seems, all alike in making wrong citations; all are to be suspected of carrying on some sinister ends and designs by them, except one faithful Admirer of Truth and Sincerity. But pray, what difficulty did these great Men see, that could deter them from citing *Tertullian* faithfully? Were they afraid, think you, of publishing an idle objection of the Pagans? Why should they be more afraid, than *Tertullian* himself? And why should they be discouraged from publishing such an objection as this, when they had published twenty others much more consider-

able? Good Doctor, be not quite so jealous and suspicious; honesty and sincerity are not yet confined to one single Person. As to these two Writers, I believe, I can give a very good account of their omissions in citing *Tertullian*. You must know, the words *ratione non deprehensâ negaverunt*, were first published from a MS. of *Fuld* by *Rigaltius* in 1635*; in all the Editions before this they were wanting; and even that of *Pamelius*, in the same year, tho' it pretends to follow that of *Rigaltius's* Text, has left them out. Is it not therefore very possible and probable too, that *Grotius* and *Huetius* might make their extracts from some Edition of *Tertullian*, which had not these words? For my own part, I had rather suppose this to be the case; and whether such a supposition may be justly admitted, I leave to the arbitration of better Judges.

* Ratione non depreh.] Utiliter imò necessariè his augeri debebat Tertull. ut fecit Rig. ex præclaro Cod. Fuld. Legebatur antea, non fierunt. Et tamen &c. Haverc. in loc.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

PAG. 12. l. 7. for ὄρα read ὄρα. l. 8. f. ἔρανῳ r. ἔρανῳ P. 19.
 Not. g f. γεγοίναι r. γεγοίναι P. 25. N. o f. Τιςερίας r. Τιςερίας.
 f. πανσελήνω r. πανσελήνω. P. 28. N. y t. Nepotnm r. Nepotum. P.
 35. l. 2. f. Efebius r. Eusebius P. 39. l. 1. f. τα r. Τα l. 2. f. δι r. δι.
 f. φρηήσεως r. φρονήσεως. l. 18. f. χρέματα r. χρήματα. P. 40. l. 23.
 dele of. P. 49. N. t f. ἔσανεῶσθαι r. ἔσανεῶσθαι. P. 52. N. z f.
 τεράττειαν r. τεράττειαν. P. 54. N. b f. ταιον r. ταις f. ὄρα ἔκτη r. ὄρα
 ἔκτη. P. 71. N. o f. μιγίς r. μιγίς. P. 72. l. 27. f. connot r. cannot.

What Good Doctor, he not quite so serious
and religious, - perhaps and kinder as he
seems to be in his letter. He is a
man of letters, I have seen his good
account of their exhibition in early American
and will know the words that we are
not to forget, were first published in
1806, and by Rogers in 1822; in all the
editions before the day were wrong, and
so that of Rogers is the first year, the
intention to follow that of Rogers, I
think, is not to be very
difficult and probable too, that Gower and
his right hand, which had not been
written for many years, but I had rather suppose
it was written by him, and I have to the
impression of his letter.

With much respect,
I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
J. W. F.

Forrest, Esq.
New York

Forrest, Esq.
New York
The 1st of January 1822
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th inst. in relation to the exhibition of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
J. W. F.

PHLEGON

Re-examined :

IN ANSWER

To Dr. SYKE'S Second DEFENCE of his
DISSERTATION

Concerning PHLEGON.

To which is added, a

POSTSCRIPT,

Concerning the CHRONICON PASCHALE.

By JOHN CHAPMAN, D.D.

THE SECOND EDITION.

Quamquam Chronologicis quibusdam difficultatibus permoti, quidam Viri Doctissimi de alia Eclipsi loqui Phlegontem existimant. — Non tamen adeo usque adeo exploratæ mihi videntur illorum rationes, ut non malim veteribus assentiri. Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. Lib. IV. c. 13.

L O N D O N :

Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball
in Ave-Mary-Lane. MDCCLII.

PHLEGOM

Re-examined:

IN ANSWER

Dr. Sykes's Second Defence of his
DISSERTATION

Concerning PHLEGOM.

To which is added, a

POSTSCRIPT.

Concerning the Legend on T. S. W. H. A. L. E.



By JOHN CHAPMAN, D.D.

The Second Edition.

Chronologiae antiquae difficultates, et
diffinitiones, et alia, quae ad
historiam antiquam pertinent, et
ad antiquitatem veteris Testamenti.
Lond. 1744. 4to. 14.

L O N D O N :

Printed for S. BIRT, at the Bible and Ball
in New-Market Lane. MDCCLXII.

P H L E G O N

Re-examined &c.

THE late *second Defence* &c. of Dr. Sykes, in which I among others am particularly concerned, is drawn up in so mild and courteous a stile, that no Adversary, I'm perswaded, has reason to be displeased with it; and for myself, I assure him, he has my best and publick acknowledgments. For besides the great Civilities and Compliments, which the Doctor has occasionally bestowed in *express* terms, his whole *Defence* is so moderate and obsequious, so full of *tacit* Concessions and Compliances, that it gives us, as I apprehend, much more of the *form* than of the *substance* of an Adversary. I must therefore beg the Reader's attention and patience, while I briefly lay before him, how things stand at present between us, how far we are advanced and agreed in the principal Points, and what those Articles are, which are now the Subject of Dispute, and remain to be considered.

It is with pleasure I observe from this *Defence*, that what I lately offer'd to the Doctor's consideration, has been so far regarded and approv'd
by

by him, that *some* things of the greatest moment, which were strongly and largely insisted on in his *Dissertation*, are now quietly dropt and laid aside; and others are so slightly and coldly defended, that they *seem* to be retain'd more for shew and appearance, than for any real weight apprehended to be in them. Thus, we see, the Critical Exceptions of *Kepler* against the Text of *Eusebius*, which before were so pompously introduced, are now fairly left to shift for themselves without one word to support them; and all the difficulty *now* urged against this Writer, is only *that* which is quite foreign to the Point, and appear'd as such in the *Dissertation* itself^a, viz. the inaccurate *Application* which *Eusebius* sometimes makes of the Authors he quotes. So again. The Argument from *Jerom* as fixing the passage of *Phlegon* to the 3^d year of Ol. 202, upon which so much stress was laid in the *Dissertation*^b, is now contentedly suppress'd and given up. And even those, which were drawn from *Africanus*, and *Origen*, and *Philoponus* are now so much chang'd and softned in the *Defence*, as to lose all that Force and Influence, which before was ascribed to them, and dwindle at last into nothing. The *Dissertation*^c was positive, that *Africanus* fixes by direct consequence *Phlegon's* Eclipse to Ol. 201. 4. It was evident, and must have been in that year and no other. But now the *Defence* is more

(a) Dissert. p. 48. (b) Dissert. p. 49. 52. (c) Dissert p. 17, 18. modelt,

modest, and *pretends* to nothing more than a *probable Conjecture*, which to make the most of it *proves* no more on his side, than mine does on the other. So again as to *Origen*, I had shewn^d in answer to the *Dissertation*, that the *Latin Tractatus* of *Origen* even according to the Doctor's interpretation, did not prove one tittle against the *testimony* or *reading* of *Phlegon*; and had farther insisted, that supposing it to prove ever so much in itself, yet it was plainly contradicted and overthrown by another passage of the same *Origen*, which was certainly genuine, still extant in the original *Greek*, and of much superior Authority. Now in reply to all this, the *Defence* says nothing to the *pertinency* of the *Latin Origen*, but contents itself^e with disputing some things in my *Interpretation* of him, which would signify but little, tho' allowed to be wrong; and as to the *Greek Origen*, first he says^f, *he has nothing to add to what he has said already*, and then tenderly asks a few Questions, which I had anticipated and considered before. The next Writer to *Origen* is *Philoponus*. He was urged in the *Dissertation*^g as *fixing* expressly *Phlegon's* Eclipse to the *second* year of Ol. 202, without the least notice of any different reading in that Author. This it was which appear'd very surprizing to me then, and continues to be so still, and of which I can give

(d) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 48, 49. seq. (e) Sec. Def. p. 41.

— 47. (f) *Ibid.* p. 48, 49. (g) *Dissert.* p. 54, 55.

no account in a Writer of common care and ingenuity, viz. the total omission of a different reading in *Philoponus*, so glaring and palpable, so material and pertinent. Now in answer to the Objection from that Writer, I shew'd^h that *Philoponus* in the very next page fixes the same Eclipse twice in Ol. 202. 4. and forms a Chronological Calculation upon it from *Phlegon* himself, proving very plainly, that the 4th year was the true year of his Eclipse. Now what says the *Defence*? Why it allowsⁱ the *Chronological Calculation*, and the different reading in *Philoponus*, but neither accounts for the omission of it in the *Dissertation*, nor can it part with the old favourite *δευτέγων*, tho' the reasons alledged against it remain unanswered. As to the parallel, which is drawn between *Philoponus* and the *Historia Miscella*, that shall be particularly considered in another place.

BUT farther. The same Abatements and Compliances are visible in the *Defence* as to other Articles. The *Dissertation* asserted roundly^k, that *Phlegon* by his "Εκλειψις could not mean any thing else besides a true natural Eclipse, and asks with the greatest confidence, whether any Writers call a Darkness extraordinary an Eclipse of the Sun. But the *Defence* seeing the judgment of Modern Criticks, and the Language of the *Antients* against it, insists no longer on the strict

(h) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 54, 55. (i) Sec. Def. p. 50, 51.

(k) *Dissert.* p. 67.

Astronomical Sense of the Word, but only disputes an Authority or two, which I had produc'd, without hurting and invalidating the main Argument. So again. The *Dissertation*^l assured us, that *Origen* had fully proved the Dark-ness and Earthquake at the Passion to have been confined to *Judæa*. But when I proved^m on the contrary, that the *Latin Origen* offer'd only a *conjecture*, and that the *Greek Origen* expressly contradicted it, the *Defence*ⁿ as before very candidly gives up the latter, and brings nothing to disprove what I said of the former, besides little exceptions of no consequence and Authority, as will be shewn hereafter.

HITHERTO we have seen, how widely the late *Defence* does evidently differ from the *Dissertation*; how far it recedes from the other's Foundations and Arguments, and how much weaker and milder an Adversary this last appears against *Phlegon*, than the former. To which must be added, that as to those *Greek* and *Latin* Authorities, which were never mentioned by the *Dissertation*, and have since been urged in favour of *Phlegon*, even these whether *original Testimonies* or only *Transcripts* from *Eusebius*, are allowed by the *Defence* to confirm unanimously the reading of *Eusebius*, which at least is one use and advantage of them very far from being small and inconsiderable.

(l) Dissert. p. 65. (m) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 76, 78.
(n) Sec. Def. p. 70.

Now

Now from all these Concessions laid together, it will easily appear, that the Doctor has in *effect* yielded up the main Points, and given to his Adversaries on one side a strength and evidence, much superior to his own on the other. For the merits of the whole Controversy depending entirely upon the reading of *Phlegon*, our reading *viz.* Ol. 202. 4. is allowed to be confirmed by several *express* and indisputable Testimonies, but the Doctor's *viz.* Ol. 201. 4. or Ol. 202. 1. has not one *direct* Authority to support it. He tells us indeed, that some of our Testimonies are only *Transcripts* from *Eusebius*; but supposing for the present that they are so, yet still as they all agree in one numeral, they must fix the reading of *Eusebius* beyond dispute, and that Authority alone is of much greater weight, than any the Doctor can produce on the contrary. So that the advantage in point of Testimony is evidently still on our side; and if the Question must be determined, as it certainly ought, by the greater Evidence, it must, I think, be determined in our favour, were we even to enter no farther into the Subject of the *Defence*. For as to those Exceptions which the Doctor has made against my performance, they are most of them Niceties, that do not much affect the main Point; and allowing them to be just, they can only prove some little mistakes in me, without helping or supporting his own

own hypothesis. However even these I shall venture to examine distinctly, and now the Reader is apprized, where the merits of the Cause lie, and how far we are advanced in it, I proceed to consider *them* in their Order.

I.

Dr. Sykes begins his Remarks upon me with observing, that notwithstanding it *seem'd evident to me*, that Suidas had *seen* the Chronological Works of Phlegon entire, there is *no positive Evidence*, that Suidas *ever saw them* at all, nor, says he, *will the Words cited in the Margin, nor Suidas's silence about Phlegon's Book being lost, prove* that ever he had seen them^o. This indeed is what I could not expect to come from one, who, I believe, would be thought no Stranger to Suidas and his way of writing. For to any one that is conversant with that Author, it must be clear and certain, I think, that he had *seen Phlegon* and read him too; and this, I imagined, was so very evident, that I did not think it necessary to dwell longer upon it. But since Dr. S. is pleased to dispute it, the Reader, I hope, will excuse me if I enlarge a little in the proof of it. Phlegon, says Suidas, wrote a Book entituled Olympiads in sixteen Books. "Εγραψεν Ολυμπιάδας ἐν δεκάτῳ βιβλίῳ 16. Which Work of his represents (in short)

(o) Second Def. p. 6, 7.

the Transactions of all Nations from the first to the 229th Olympiad. "Ἐστὶ δὲ μέχρι τῆς 229. Ολυμπιάδος τὰ πραχθέντα παύλαχθ. In these words, you see, *Suidas* not only informs us, that *Phlegon* had published such a Work, but tells us likewise the Subject, Nature, and extent of it, and in what *Olympiad* it ends, using at the same time the *present tense* in his account of it, as of things then in being and known to himself; by which we can in reason I think, presume nothing less, than that *Phlegon's Olympiads* were extant in his time, and that he had *seen* them himself. For suppose a Writer at this time was to give an account of *Usher* and his Works, and speaking of his *Annals* should say in the *present tense*, that they *contain* a compendious History of all Nations from the beginning of the World to the year of Christ 73; or suppose another Writer speaking of the Works of *Joseph Scaliger*, should mention among the rest his Ολυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ, and should say, they *contain* a short account of historical facts from the 1st to the end of the 249th. Olympiad, would not any one in future Ages, that should meet with these Writers, presume that the one had *seen Usher's Annals*, and the other *Scaliger's Olympiads*, and that both of them spoke in this manner from their own Knowledge of those Books? Undoubtedly they would, and must take it for granted, unless *positive* Evidence should appear to the contrary. And the same must

must here be presum'd concerning *Suidas*; and that not only for the reasons mentioned above, but for others also peculiar to that Writer. It is frequently his way, when he has told us the Works of an Author, to let us know in short the nature and subject of them, introducing his account with the words here used ἐστὶ δέ. And this is one of the strongest Intimations he ever gives (as far as I can discern) of any Book's being extant in his time. Thus speaking of *Philostratus* the elder and his Works, he mentions his Book entitled Γυμνασικόν, and then adds to explain it, ΕΣΤΙ ΔΕ ΠΕΡΙ Τῶ ἐν ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑ ἐπιπλεγμένων^a. So again, speaking of *Philistus* the Historian, *he wrote*, says he, Σικελικά. ΕΣΤΙ ΔΕ τὰ πρὸς Ἕλληνας αὐτοῖς παραχθέντα ἀναφόρων^b. Again, in *Pherocydes* the *Athenian*, "Ἐγραψεν Αὐτόχθονας, *He wrote a Book* entitled Αὐτόχθονες. ΕΣΤΙ ΔΕ ΠΕΡΙ Τῆς ΑΤΤΙΚΗΣ ἀρχαιολογίας ἐν βιβλίοις δέκα^c. Once more; in his account of *Diodorus Siculus*, *He wrote* says he, a Βιβλιοθήκη. ΕΣΤΙ ΔΕ ἱστορία Ρωμαϊκὴ τε καὶ πεικίλη ἐν βιβλίοις μ^d. These are a few instances out of many more † that might be produc'd, shewing fully the true meaning and force of this passage about *Phlegon*; which at least must be understood to signify, that *Suidas* had seen *Phlegon*; otherwise

(a) Suid. v. Φιλόστρατος ὁ πρῶτος.

(b) Id. v. Φίλιππος.

(c) Id. v. Φερικύδης Ἀθην.

(d) Id. v. Διόδωρος ὁ Σικελ.

(†) Vid. Suid. v. Διογενεσιανός. Θεόπομπος. Ιάμβελος. Καλλιμάχος. Παύσανος. Περικύδης. Σωτήριος. Σώφρων. Σπυρίδης. Τηλέφω. Χάρις. Λαμψάκης.

it will be difficult to prove, that *Suidas* had *seen* the Works of any Writer that he treats of. For he never is so nice and particular, as to say, *these Books* are extant, and *those* are not, *these I have read*, and *those I have not read*; neither is it more than once (as I remember) that he has any thing like it; and that is in his account of *Lycurgus* the Orator, where he tells us how many *genuine* Orationes of that Author were *preserved** in his time. In all other places he only gives a Catalogue of those Writings he knew of, interspersing here and there, as I said before, brief explications of the design and subject of some pieces. And with this general Evidence the best *modern* Criticks are satisfied, and readily suppose that either he had *seen* the Books he mentions, or at least that they were extant in his time, where nothing very glaring and positive appears to the contrary. Besides, to remove at once all doubt concerning *Phlegon*, *Suidas* himself has quoted that Writer's Authority in a point of History. For speaking of *Thales*, he acquaints us that *according to Phlegon*, that Philosopher was even *famous* so early as the 7th Olympiad, whereas others had placed his *Birth* so low as the 35th. This

(*) Λόγοι ὃ αὐτῷ εἰσι οἱ ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΟΙ γνήσιοι &c. Suid. v. Λύκουργος.

(c) Γερωνὶς πρὸ Κρείσσου, ἐπὶ τῷ λγ' Ὀλυμπιάδῃ. κατὰ δὲ ΦΛΕΓΟΝΤΑ γινωσκόμενος ἡδὲ ἐπὶ τῷ ζ*. Suid. v. Θαλῆς.

* The numeral ζ seems to me to be either a corrupt reading for λζ. or else *Phlegon* might be speaking perhaps of the old Lyric Poet
sure

sure is *positive Evidence*, and taken with the other will I hope put an End to the Doctor's Scruples on that head.

II.

NEITHER can I quit my claim to *Photius*, or despair of succeeding with his Authority, notwithstanding the difficulties now started against him. For 'tis easy to prove from his way of writing likewise, that *Phlegon's Olympiads* were all extant in his time, and safe in his hands, tho' he had *read* no more than *five Books*. It is usual with him, if any Book was either absolutely lost or never seen by him, to let his Reader know it in *express* terms; and where he gives us no notice of this kind, and yet tells us the Writings of any Author, we are always to presume that those Writings were then extant, and had fallen within his knowledge. Thus speaking of *Theopompus's Historical Books*, he says, *there were only fifty three of them preserv'd*, and that he had *never seen the sixth, seventh, ninth, twentieth, and thirtieth*^f. So

Thales, who flourish'd long before Thales the Philosopher, and Suidas might misunderstand him as speaking of the latter.

(f) Ἀνεγνώσθηται Θεοπόμπου Λόγοι ἑσπεριοί. Πεντήκοντα δὲ καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΟΙ αὐτοῦ τῶν ἑσπεριῶν λόγοι. Διαπαρακείμεναι δὲ καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν πρὸς ἑφάκταν τήντι ἑκτην, καὶ ἑβδομην, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν οὐνάτην ἔειχεν καὶ τὴν τετρακστήν· ἄλλα ταύτας μὴ ΟΥΔ' ἩΜΕΙΣ ΕἶΔΟΜΕΝ. Phot. Cod. CLXXVI. p. 390.

again, speaking of *Memnon's* βιβλίον ἱστορικόν, I have read, says he, in it from the ninth to the sixteenth Book, but as to the eight first Books and those that follow the sixteenth, I cannot say, that I ever saw them. The same exactness does he observe as to other Writers, which for brevity's sake I here omit, and only refer to some few of them in the margin*. Now as to *Phlegon's Olympiads*, the great Critic never mentions a syllable, that any part of *them* was either lost in his time, or never came to his hands, which he certainly would have done, as he does at other times, if either of those cases had happened then. He tells us indeed, that he had read only five Books of that Work, which carried him as far as 177th Olympiad; but this is no proof, that the rest were lost, or not then in his possession. For in the same manner he tells us, that he had read only five Books of an Ecclesiastical History written by one *Joannes a Presbyter*^h; tho' he tells us at the same time, that there were ten Books in all, as the Author himself had promis'd. If it still should be objected, as the Doctor has hinted, that *Photius* with regard to *Phlegon* has not told us

(g) Ἀργυρόδην βιβλίον Μήμονος ἱστορικόν ἀπὸ θ' εἰς (leg. θ) λόγῳ ἔως ἑκτῆς καὶ δεκάτου. — Τὰς δὲ πρώτας ἡ ἱστορίας καὶ τὰς μετὰ τὴν ἑκτὴν καὶ δεκάτην ἔπειτα εἰπὼν Εἰς ΘΕΑΝ ΗΜΩΝ ΑΦΙΓΜΕΝΑΣ ΕΧΟΜΕΝ. Id. Cod. CCXXIV. p. 704, 757.

* *Arrian*. Cod. LVIII. *Phrynichus*. Cod. CLVIII. *Agatharoides*. Cod. CCXIII.

(h) Τὰς μὲντοιγα ἱστορίας αὐτῆς δέκα τοξάνουσι τόμοι, αἱ καὶ αὐτὰς οὐκ αὐτὰς ἐπιτελείται. ΩΝ ΗΜΙΝ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΕΝΤΕ γέγονεν ἀναγνώται. *Phot.* Cod. XLI.

the

the number of Books in the whole Work, as he does in other Cases; I answer, that he has said what is equivalent to it, he tells us, how low it was carried by *Phlegon*, viz. down to *Adrian's* Times, which Remark was sufficient, and made the number of Books less necessary to be mentioned; and for this Reason it is, that in the first part of this Code, where he is most particular about *Phlegon's* Chronicle, he says nothing even of the number of Books which he had read, but only *the Olympiads* thro' which he had pass'd; and when he afterwards speaks of *five* Books, he does it plainly by the bye, and in such a manner, as shews it was not his Design at first to give us an exact number of Books in the whole Work; that being of no great consequence, when the compass and extent of it from Beginning to End had been intimated already. But I find the grand difficulty of all with *Dr. Sykes* lies in these Words of *Photius*, *he descends*, as he himself says (*ὡς αὐτός φησι*) down to *Adrian's* Time. Why, asks the Doctorⁱ, as he himself says, if the Book was in his own hands, and he could see how low he came? I answer, not to intimate that *Photius* himself had not seen the whole Work, or that the whole was not extant, but that the Reader might be assur'd even from *Phlegon* himself, that he had carried his Chronicle down to *Adrian's* Times. This additional

(i) Sec, Def. p. 8.

Evidence from *Phlegon's* own Mouth was much more full and satisfactory, than the bare report of *Photius* could have been; because it was indisputably clear from thence, that no Writer after *Phlegon's* Time had added any thing to *Phlegon's* original Chronicle, but that the whole of it was genuine and uncorrupted. Neither is this expression of *Photius* one jot more strange or difficult than that of *Gerard J. Vossius* in his Account of *Polyanus*, *nongenta* (ut ipse in *Prefatione* ait) *præstantium ducum strategemata complexus est*^k. Here likewise we have as he himself says, and yet no one I imagine, would conclude from hence, that *Vossius* had never seen any of these *strategemata*; tho' according to Dr. *Sykes* he should never have seen one of them, since he only refers to *Polyanus's* account of them, without mentioning one that he had read himself. The truth is, such references to Authors themselves about the nature and extent of their Works are frequent among *Antients* and *Moderns*, to give the greater Credit and Authority to their Accounts of Books; as you may see in *Fabricius*, under the Articles *Dioscorides*, *Arrian*, *Galen*, *Clemens of Alexandria* &c. To all which I must farther observe, that *Photius* himself does naturally lead us to such an Interpretation of his

(k) *Polyanus*. Hic Divis. fratribus dedicavit octo Libros, quibus *nongenta* (ut ipse in *Prefatione* ait) *præstantium Ducum strategemata complexus est*. Voss. *Histor. Græc.* L. II. c. XIV.

Words, if we will but attend to them. *Phlegon*, says he, *begins his collection from the 1st Olympiad*, and descends as low as *Adrian's Times*¹. Here the verb *κατεσι* descends is in the present tense, just as *ἀρχεται* begins was before, which could with no propriety of Language be us'd in this case, if the Books, in which he did descend thus low, had been either lost, or unknown to *Photius*. The Critick in either of these cases would most certainly have us'd another tense, and said, *he descended down to Adrian's Times*, to intimate, what *Phlegon* had done when he wrote his *Olympiads*, tho' now a great part of them was no longer extant, or not to be found. This seems to me the most probable supposition, and with it I conclude the present Article; hoping that by this time it appears sufficiently, that *Phlegon's Olympiads* were extant at least till A. D. 1000.

III.

BUT it seems admitting all this, I'm likely to gain nothing by it, for the Doctor^m will not allow any Author of those I have cited, except *Eusebius* and *Philoponus* to have ever look'd into *Phlegon*, and will shew that all but one

(1) Ἀρχεται ὁ συναγωγὴς ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης Ὀλυμπιάδος ———
ΚΑΤΕΙΣΙ ὅς, ὡς αὐτὸς φησιν, μέχρι τῆς Ἀδριανῆς χρόνου. Phot. Cod.
XCVII. p. 265.

(m) Sec. Def. p. 9.

were mere transcribers from *Eusebius*. Well, if so, sure the Text of *Eusebius* must be fix'd beyond all dispute, when so many Writers transcribe it, and all agree in representing the same numeral. This alone is a great point gained, and of such importance in the present dispute, that it makes me less solicitous about others of a lower Nature. However let us see how the Doctor succeeds in these.

HE begins with the *Chronicon Paschale*ⁿ, and assures us, that this Author transcrib'd the passage of *Phlegon* in both places from *Eusebius*; and the proof he gives of it is, that the *Chronicon* introduces the citation with Φλέγων ὁ τὰς Ολυμπιάδας συναγαγών, and ends with ταῦτα ὁ δουλῶν ἀνὴρ, exactly as *Eusebius* had done before him. Wonderful indeed, that the *Chronicon* and *Eusebius* should jump together in two phrases so common and obvious, that they could not well be miss'd by any *Greek* Writer quoting *Phlegon*! At least they would naturally occur to his thoughts, without ever seeing or hearing of *Eusebius*. For what is there in them particular and extraordinary, what turn of thought or singularity of expression, that would not readily arise to any *Greek* Author speaking of *Phlegon*? If so, where is the reason or necessity for making them *Transcripts*? To me, I must own, they appear of so little force and consequence, as not to deserve any farther conside-

(n) Sec. Def. p. 11. 17, 21.

ration. But other Expressions there are in the *Chronicon* of much greater weight, and such as, I think, will evidently prove, that the Author of it did not *transcribe* from *Eusebius* in this passage about *Phlegon*. He has quoted *Phlegon* twice, and in the first passage he introduces him with saying, *The Pagans had taken particular notice of this year (viz. the year of the Passion) mentioning expressly an earthquake as happening at the time, and particularly Phlegon &c.* Οἱ ἔξωθεν δὲ τὸ ἐνιαυτὸν τῆτον ὀπισθημῆσαντο, ἀσφαλῶς εἰπόντες καὶ τὸν σεισμὸν γενόμενον, καὶ κατ' ἐξαιρετὸν Φλέγων, &c. These words have something particular and emphatical in them; and if they had been extant in *Eusebius*, might justly be call'd Transcripts. But not a syllable of them appears in *Eusebius*, except the word Φλέγων. So again, we may observe other differences between the two Authors. The *Chronicon* has ἐν τῷ ιγ' συγγράμματι. *Eusebius* has nothing of συγγράμματι. The *Chronicon* has only λέγει ἔτως, *Eusebius* has αὐτοῖς ῥήμασιν τὰδε. The *Chronicon* adds after δηλωθεὶς ἀνῆλθ', γινῆς τὸ παρὰ δόξαν τὸ ἐκλείψεως τῆς Ἡλίου, *Eusebius* has only δηλωθεὶς ἀνῆλθ'. Is this like a bare *Transcriber* from *Eusebius*? Or could he well have varied more from him in the compass of so few lines? Besides to make amends for his *Ολυμπιάδας συναγαγὼν* before, in the second passage he changes his stile into *Ὁ παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησι χρονολογούσις ἰσότησε Φλέγων**

(†) *Chronicon* Pateh. p. 219. Ed. Par. (*) Ibid. p. 222.

of which nothing appears in *Eusebius*, and which shews, that the Author of the *Chronicon* was not unacquainted with *Phlegon*. Now if all these Circumstances together will not prove *him* to be an Original Testimony, I desire to know how any one either *antient* or *modern* can be proved to be so? For where several Writers quote the same passage of an Author, there will of course be accidental similitudes of Expression in some of them, tho' they have all recourse to the Author himself. And if these little similitudes in *some* things are sufficient to prove the later Writers *Transcribers* from those that wrote before them, tho' they differ very much in *others*, I'm afraid, very few *modern* Criticks and Writers of Antiquities will escape that character, whatever they may plead in their favour.

As to other passages in the *Chronicon*, which the Doctor informs us, are really transcribed from *Eusebius*, they have no relation to the passage about *Phlegon*, and therefore I shall not trouble the Reader with any nice examination of them. Only one mistake of the Doctor's I cannot but take notice of, his affirming that those *instances* which he *has mentioned* as *Transcripts* from *Eusebius*, *had escaped* the learned Editor of the *Chronicon DuFreſne*^a, whereas the Reader may find upon consulting the Editor's Annotations, that not *one* of the Doctor's *Instances* *had escaped him*, but were all particularly observ'd,

(a) Sec. Def. p. 20.

with those very Remarks upon them which the Doctor has given us in his *Defence*. Neither shall I enter here into any dispute about the Antiquity or Authors of the *Chronicon*, having reserv'd the discussion of that point for another place. Whether it was compil'd by one or two Authors, in the same or different Ages, is not necessary now to enquire; my Argument at present does not depend upon a clear resolution of those Queries either one way or other; and therefore a long digression upon them at this time may conveniently be spared. It is enough for me, that the *Chronicon* was compos'd while *Phlegon's* Olympiads were in being, that the Testimonies in it are certainly original ones, clear and strong to my point, and of more Authority than a hundred Surmises and Conjectures. The very Words of *Phlegon* are *twice* quoted in it, and his Eclipse in both places fixed to the *fourth* year of Ol. 202, without the least variation of the numeral, excepting only that *fourth* is in one express'd by $\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\pi\tau\omega$, and in the other by δ' . * This is so express and remarkable an Authority, that it may well deserve the name of *principal*, and might justly have claim'd a place in the *Dis-*

(*) I must own myself guilty of a little oversight in saying (p. 17. of *Phlegon examin'd &c.*) that the *Chronicon* in both places had express'd the fourth year by $\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\pi\tau\omega$ at length. But I was led into it by Raderus's Edition, where it is so express'd (p. 520, 526.) and overlooked the alteration that was made by the Paris Edition.

fertation, however disagreeable it might be to the design of it. What reason the Doctor had for omitting it at first, I was much at a loss to know, but am now told by the *Defence*^b, that the reason of it was, because the Author was so close a Transcriber from *Eusebius*. Whether this was a sufficient or the only one, I leave the Reader to judge from the following passage in the *Dissertation*, *There are no other Evidences that I know of, except these which have been produced*^c.

IV.

THE next Writer that falls in the Doctor's way is *Philoponus*^d, who, it seems, is readily granted to have been an Original Citer from *Phlegon*, but is still claim'd as a good Authority on the Doctor's side. This is a proof to me, that Dr. S. apprehends himself in great want of Authorities, when he stickles so hard for one, that in all equitable construction is directly against him. For *Philoponus* does himself, as I have shewn before at large^e, place *Phlegon's* Eclipse expressly in Ol. 202. 4. comparing moreover the Olympiads with the years of *Tiberius* according to *Phlegon's* own Accounts, and from thence inferring that *Phlegon* must mean by his Eclipse the Darkness at our Saviour's Passion,

(b) Sec. Def. p. 21.

(c) Dissert. p. 64.

(d) Sec. Def. p. 22, 30, 51.

(e) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 54.

because they both happened in the same year viz. the XIXth of *Tiberius* and Ol. 202. 4. Does not this shew indisputably, that the same *Philoponus* could not (morally speaking) place this same Eclipse of *Phlegon* in another year, i. e. 17th of *Tiberius* and Ol. 202. 2.? And if another year is express'd in the present corrupt Edition of him, that 'tis manifestly wrong? Yet plain as this is, Dr. S. still contends for the numeral δευτέρω, in spite of *Philoponus* himself and the whole tenor of the context. The only reason of which strong perseverance seems to be, that the Doctor thinks it necessary for his hypothesis to have one positive Authority, and that the only one he has any pretence to, is that of *Philoponus*. If this too should be quite given up, then the darling Hypothesis will have nothing to support it, and *Phlegon* may return to the place, from whence the Doctor ejected him.

HOWEVER let us hear what he offers for δευτέρω. I see no reason to correct it as an Error without a MS. that would shew the fault.^f Why not, if 'tis plainly absurd and inconsistent with *Philoponus* himself? *Fabricius* and other Learned Men have ventur'd to correct many things in this piece without a MS. and why may not we presume to do the same, when the Author does evidently require it? Oh! but the Doctor will easily account for the two different and clashing readings, by paralleling the Case

(f) Sec. Def. p. 51.

of *Philoponus* with another that I had furnish'd him with from the *Historia Miscella*. This last Writer, as I had observed, applied *Phlegon's* Eclipse to the Darkness at the Passion, tho' he places the Passion himself in the 17th of *Tiberius*, and allows expressly that *Phlegon's* Eclipse is related as happening in the 19th. Now why, says Dr. Sykes^h, cannot the same account be given for *Philoponus*? Or in other words, why cannot *Philoponus* in the same manner apply *Phlegon's* Eclipse to the Passion, tho' he vice versa places the Passion in the 19th of *Tiberius*, and quotes *Phlegon* as placing his Eclipse in the 17th or Ol. 202. 2. ? I answer, because in fact there is no parallel in the two Cases. *Philoponus* does not only apply (as the other does) *Phlegon's* Eclipse to the Passion, but quotes *Phlegon* himself as placing his Eclipse in that very year, wherein he places the Passion viz. XIXth of *Tiberius* and Ol. 202. 4. This makes a wide difference between the two Writers. The one applies *Phlegon* to the Passion, tho' he owns the Text of *Phlegon* is against him; the other appeals to the Text of *Phlegon*, and grounds his Application of him entirely upon that Text. The Words of *Philoponus* are these†. That Phle-

(g) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 31, 32.

(h) Sec. Def. p. 51.

(†) Οπ δὲ τ' ἐν τῷ ταυρῷ πῦ Διοπίτη Χρίστου γενομένης τῷ
 Ηλίου Εκλείψεως, καὶ ὅτι ἑτέρας ἐμνήσθη Φλέγων. Πρῶτον μὲν &c. —
 Καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὅτι περὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἱστορίας δέκνυται. Βασιλέ-
 ουν γὰρ αὐτόν ΦΗΣΙΝ ὁ ΦΛΕΓΩΝ τὰς δευτέρας ἔτη τ' ἑκατῆς ἐν-
 νενηγῆς ὀγδόης Ὀλυμπιάδος, τὴν δὲ ἑκλείψην γεγενῆσθαι τὰς ΤΕΤΑΡΤΩ
 ἔτη τ' διακοσιῆς δευτέρας Ὀλυμπιάδος. *Philopon. in Genes. Lib.*
 II. c. 21. p. 89.

gon's Eclipse is no other than that which happened at the crucifixion of our Lord Christ — is prov'd from the History itself of Tiberius Cæsar. For Phlegon says, that he began his reign in the 2d year of Ol. 198, and that the Eclipse happened in the fourth year of the 202d Olympiad, &c. This sure is something more than a bare Application of Phlegon; it is a plain quotation of, and appeal to Phlegon's own Words; and as he here evidently refers to Phlegon's Text for his fourth year, that year can never be reconcil'd with second year a few lines distant, without supposing Philoponus to be either a most false or negligent Writer. The former of these Characters Dr. Sykes had good Nature and Charity enough at first to fix upon Philoponus, for no other reason in the world, that I could apprehend, but to serve his own Hypothesis by keeping in δυνάμει; but now upon my expostulations with him on that head, he gravely rebukes me for imagining such hard Things, and using such hard Words, just as if I thought that every Man that mistakes or misapplies another's Words, or by any means Reasons inconsistently, is a Knave or a Foolⁱ. Far be it from me to think any such thing of any Writer whatsoever; but by this soft Language the Doctor would intimate, that he was far from ever sacrificing Philoponus for a Knave or a Fool, as I had ventur'd to charge him; and that all which he had said of him was

(i) Sec. Dec. p. 51.

only to shew, that he had *mistaken* or *misapplied Phlegon* by oversight, and so *reasoned inconsistently*. Whereas this really is mere Artifice and Evasion; for the Doctor represented *Philoponus* as *talking inconsistently* by design, as *wilfully misquoting & misapplying Phlegon*, as *forcing Phlegon into his Service contrary to the express Words of Phlegon* then lying before himⁱ. What is this but calling *Philoponus* a Knave, tho' in other Words? Since he could not act, as Dr. S. represents him, without being such a Man, and deserving that Name. *Hard* therefore as this *Word* is, Dr. Sykes might himself have bestowed it on him, since he charges him with the *Thing*. The favour is pretty much the same, whether you give him that Title, or represent him as deserving it. However now, it seems, the Doctor will be so kind as to save the *Honesty* of *Philoponus*, since his End may be serv'd another way. To secure his *δευτέρον* he will now only make him a Dreamer; that is, he maintains, that *Philoponus* almost in the same breath did really quote *Phlegon* as placing his Eclipse in two different years in the *second* and *fourth* year of Ol. 202. A great piece of Condescension truly! which pays such a Compliment to *Philoponus*, as that Writer would reject with a just Scorn and Indignation, and such as few Men pretending to Candour and Impartiality would, I think, ever force upon him. I leave

(i) First Def. p. 42.

it therefore to every one, to pronounce upon it, as he pleases, and go on to consider what the Doctor objects to my *Latin Writers*.

V.

JEROM, says Dr. Sykes^a, was a professed Translator of Eusebius, and therefore he is no additional Evidence; and Anastasius too professes in terms that he translates Eusebius. A mighty discovery indeed! When I myself had declared all this very frankly before, as the Reader may see by consulting my Treatise^b. I there produc'd both *Jerom* and *Anastasius* as translating *Eusebius*; and my chief design in producing these Authorities, was to settle and ascertain the Text of *Eusebius*, which was then much disputed by Dr. Sykes, and affirmed to be very doubtful and precarious. We were told, that we could not be certain, whether it should be δ'. or δε', and A or B were offer'd as the true and more probable numeral in *Eusebius*; to obviate and silence which little exceptions, those *Latin Translators* were introduc'd, who plainly confirmed the numeral δ'. by their *quarto anno*, and in that respect were so many distinct and positive Testimonies against *Kepler* and Dr. Sykes. So that if they answer'd that End, it was sufficient for me,

(a) Sec. Def. p. 23.

(b) *Phlegon* examined p. 12, 13, 26.

and all that I wanted. I observ'd indeed that even these tho' professed *Translators* of *Eusebius*, were probably something more than bare *Translators*, and had consulted *Phlegon's* Original *Olympiads*; being both of them Men of Learning, and capable of consulting that Author. As to *Jerom* the Case is clear, that he had seen and read *Phlegon*, for he expressly refers to him in his *Hebrew Questions* upon *Genesis*. And as to *Anastasius*, he is known to have been a Scholar, and besides that, was qualified sufficiently by his Office of *Bibliothecarius* or *Library Keeper at Rome* for a diligent and curious search after Books, and was probably prefer'd to that Office for his Extraordinary Abilities in point of Literature. These Circumstances alone, tho' they will not prove directly, that he ever did *in fact* consult *Phlegon*, nor were urg'd by me as sufficient to prove so much, yet they give him a great advantage over any *modern*, by shewing him to be capable of doing it; and by making him in that sense an *original* Testimony. For we may argue at least *negatively* from thence, that no one has any right to pronounce that he *never* did consult *Phlegon*, and compare *Eusebius* with his Original; which may be pronounc'd of any *modern*, how learned and inquisitive soever.

(c) Legamus Varronis de Antiquitatibus Libros, & Sifinnii Capitonis; & Gracum Phlegonta, cæterosque eruditissimos Viros. Hieron. Quæstion. Hebraic. in Genes. cap. X. v. 4.

This

This was all I desir'd as to him, and all that I intended by setting forth his Age and Abilities.

THE other two Latins, *Freculphus* and the *Historia Miscella*, as they quote *Phlegon* in their Histories, without any mention of *Eusebius* or reference to him, were indeed considered in another view, and urg'd as direct and positive Testimonies. But Dr. *Sykes* can by no means allow them to be such. For, says he, *Freculphus transcrib'd verbatim Jerom's Latin Version of Eusebius*, and the *Miscella Historia translates Eusebius*. It is granted they do so; but how does it appear, that they went no farther than *Eusebius*, and that they never look'd into *Phlegon* himself? This we cannot or ought not to conclude immediately, because one *translates Eusebius*, and the other *transcribes a Latin Version of him*. I am sensible indeed, that the very act of *transcribing* will create strong prejudices against them, and will be judged by many a convincing Proof, that they took all their Knowledge and Account of *Phlegon* from *Eusebius*. But this sort of Argument (tho' often us'd in other Cases) is by no means conclusive and satisfactory to me. For however strange it may appear to us *Moderns*, 'tis certain that among the *Antients* both *Greeks* and *Romans* it was a common practise for one Writer to quote an Author in the Words of another, tho' he had seen the Author himself, and was well acquainted with him. I could give a

great number of Instances of this kind, if this was a proper place for large Collections; but at present a few Examples from one Writer may suffice, and that Writer shall be a *Latin* one, as those are which are now under debate. *Macrobius* quotes *Varro* after this manner. *M. Varro in Libro rerum Humanarum quam de diebus scripsit, Homines, inquit, qui ex mediâ nocte ad proximam mediam noctem his horis viginti quatuor nati sunt, uno die nati dicuntur, Quibus verbis ita videtur dierum observationem divisisse, ut &c^d.* Now this whole passage together with the Introduction and Comment following is transcribed *verbatim* from *Gellius*^e, as any one may see, that will compare the two Writers. So again. The same Author quotes *Virgil* thus: *Virgilius quoque id ipsum ostendit, ut hominem decuit poeticas res agentem reconditâ atque opertâ veteris ritûs significatione,*

— Torquet, *inquit*, medios nox humida cursus,

Et me sævus equis Oriens afflavit anhelis. *His enim verbis diem, quem Romani civilem appellaverunt, à sextâ noctis horâ oriri admonet^f.* This passage too from Beginning to End is taken word for word from the same *Gellius*^g. In the same manner has he quoted *Cæsar*^h, and *Claudius Quadrigarius*ⁱ, and forty more. And

(d) *Macrobius Saturnal. Lib. I. c. 3.*

(e) *A. Gell. Noct.*

Attic. Lib. III. c. 2.

(f) *Macrobius. ibid.*

(g) *Id. ibid.*

(h) *Id. Lib. I. c. v. Conf. Gell. L. I. c. x.*

(i) *Id. Lib. I. c. xvi. Conf. Gell. L. V. c. xvii.*

yet no one, I believe, imagines, that *Macrobius* had not consulted *Virgil*, *Varro*, *Cæsar*, and *Claudius*, tho' he does not transcribe their Words immediately from the Original, but from *Gellius* who went before him. Neither is *Macrobius* singular in this way of quoting Authors, but as I said before, it was a common practise among *Greeks* and *Latins*, profane and Ecclesiastical. Why therefore may not *Freculphus* and the *Historia Miscella* do the same, and yet be in effect original Testimonies? As to *Freculphus*, he assures us himself, that the passages which he quotes by Name from antient Writers are represented by him, as he found them in the Authors themselves; *sententias illorum*, says he, *assumpsi, ut in suis habentur Libris*^k. If so, there is certainly no reason, why *Phlegon* should be excepted out of the Number. And as to *Paulus Warnefridus* the Author of the *Historia Miscella*, his great Character for Learning in the Age he liv'd, and his skill in History, are so many Arguments in his favour, and a just foundation for presuming, that *Phlegon* was not unknown to him, tho' he chose to speak of him in the Words of *Eusebius*. But this, you will say, is nothing more than a presumption; 'tis no direct Evidence that he actually consulted *Phlegon*. Very true: nor am I oblig'd in all Cases of this kind to produce direct Evidence. The Quotation itself of *Phlegon* is evidence sufficient, unless you prove something positively to the

(k) *Freculph. Præf. Chron.*

contrary. Now I say, that his quoting *Phlegon* in the words of *Eusebius* is no proof, that he either had not *seen*, or had not *Phlegon* then lying before him. For it was common to many others besides him to use the words of an eminent Writer, as *Eusebius* was, rather than his own. If indeed a Man of no Character *transcribes*, we may justly suspect that he *only* transcribes. But *Paulus* was a Man of that reputation for Learning, that *Charles the Great* invited him into *France* to assist in erecting Schools and Academies, and to be one of the Restorers of Learning in that Nation. In which Office he acquitted himself so well, that he became a chief favourite with *Charles*, and was much courted and admir'd by all Men of Letters¹. This makes a great difference in the Case, and should incline us to put the best rather than the worst Construction upon him; We should not reject him absolutely as *no original* Testimony at all; for *that* he may be, and most probably was as to the Knowledge of *Phlegon*, tho' not in the *form* of quoting him. At least neither *He* nor *Freculphus* nor any other Writer, that liv'd while *Phlegon's* Works were in Being, are like *modern* Transcribers or Translators of *Eusebius*, such as *Usher*, *Grotius* and *Huetius* &c. The latter could *only* tran-

(1) Vid. Voss. Histor. Lat. L. II. c. 30. Cave. Histor. Literar. Vol. I. p. 493. Oudin. de Scriptor. Eccles. Tom. I. p. 1923. Fol.

scribe, being wholly destitute of the Original; but the former could easily have recourse to *Phlegon* himself, whenever they pleased. This is a Circumstance, which gives to the Antients much more Authority in the present Case, than the *moderns* however great and Learned can possibly require; and therefore the distinction between them is necessary to be observed in opposition to Dr. *Sykes*, who confounded them one with another, and put them all upon a level^m.

BUT if these may be called *original* Testimonies, then *Malela* and *Maximus*, says Dr. *Sykes*ⁿ, have an equal right to that Title. For they liv'd within the same times, and have quoted *Phlegon*, as well as the others. Here we have two Writers more, of whom no mention was made in the *Dissertation*; and which at that time, I suppose, were not known to Dr. S. as he *knew* of no other Evidences, except those which were then produc'd^o. But to punish us for producing them, they are now it seems to be turned against us, and overthrow our own reasonings. I must confess indeed, they both did *live within the time* specified, but they are not to be ranked with the other Writers, nor are they of the same Authority, because, as I hinted before^p, they neither of them quote the *very words* of *Phlegon*. As to *Max-*

(m) First Def. p. 6, 7.

(n) Sec. Def. p. 27.

(o) Dissertat. p. 64.

(p) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 19.

imus, nothing can be more evident at first sight; He only says in loose and general terms, that *Phlegon* in the 13th Book of his *Chronicles* in the 203^d *Olympiad* takes notice of this *Eclipse* 9. What is this to the original Words of *Phlegon*, set forth by *Eusebius*, *Philoponus*, and the rest? 'Tis true he differs from the others in the *Olympiad*, but in so indeterminate and inaccurate a way, that no stress can be reasonably laid upon it; and if any regard is to be paid to it, let the Doctor remember, that he comes much nearer to Ol. 202. 4. than to Ol. 201. 4. or 202. 1. And as to *Malela*, he plainly substitutes^r the years of *Tiberius* from his own Conjecture instead of the *Olympiad* express'd in *Phlegon*; and so is of no use in determining the original year of his *Eclipse*. This is not *gratis* said, as the Doctor^r would persuade us; for if *Phlegon* himself had noted the year of *Tiberius*, how comes it to pass, that not one of all the other Writers gives us the least intimation of it? And why does *Philoponus* take so round about a way by long Calculations to shew the year of *Tiberius* in which this *Eclipse* happened, if that year was

(9) Μέμνηται μὲν καὶ Φλέγων ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς Χρονόγραφος ἐν τεσσαρδekaτῇ τῶν Χρονογραφιῶν ἐν τῇ σγ'. Ολυμπιάδι τῆς Ἑκλείψιος ταύτης, παρὰ τὸ εἶδος λέγων γίνεσθαι, οὐ μὲν τὸν τρόπον ἀνέγραψε. Maxim. in Schol. p. 97.

(1) Τὰ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτη ἔτει τῆς Βασιλείας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐγένετο Ἑκλείψις ἡλίου μεγίστη πλέον ἢ ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον καὶ νῦν ὅτι πηρὲν ὥρα ἕκτη τῆς ἡμέρας ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας φαίνεσθαι. Malela p. 310. Ipsa *Phlegontis* verba non producit Auctor noster. Annot. in loc.

(1) Sec. Def. p. 29.

marked

marked ready to his hands by *Phlegon* himself; who then lay before him? Besides, this *Malela* is known to be so negligent and ignorant a Writer^a, and his Credit and Authority is now so very low, that his Testimony has very little weight in it. And for this reason it was, that I said no more of him in my former Discourse. An *Original* he may be as much as the Doctor pleases, and in more senses than one; but he is such an *Original*, as I willingly resign into his Hands, and wish him all possible success with it.

VI.

I come now in the last place to *Eusebius*, who is an Author so eminent and considerable; so full and express in the Case of *Phlegon*, that Dr. *Sykes* cannot suffer his Testimony to stand without exception, tho' none can be better establish'd, or more strongly attested, than it is: One would think that so many *Translators* and *Transcribers* of it, in different Ages and Places, without the least variation as to *Phlegon*, might fix and ascertain the truth of it in *his* Opinion beyond all doubt and contradiction. Yet he cannot be prevail'd with to acquiesce in it; he cannot depend upon his Numbers, it is still a question whether he has given us the passage of *Phlegon* exactly or not†. I really should be glad to

(a) Vid. Hodii Prolegom. in Malel. §. 27. Bentlei Epistol. post Malel.

(†) Sec. Def. p. 9; 10.

know, what sort or quantity of proof Dr. S. would require in such a Case, if this will not satisfy him. To what purpose are *any* antient Authorities, that can be produced, if these will not convince him? But, it seems, the *ground of his doubt* is, that *Eusebius* sometimes *very much mistook* or *confounded times in other Authors*, and *dragged into his service passages, which had no relation to the Subject in hand*. For which reason it may justly be enquired, whether he has dealt more fairly by *Phlegon* than he has done in the same place by other Authors and other facts. This is the Sum of his Objection, started first in the *Dissertation**, dropped afterwards by the same as foreign to the point, because the *mere Words of Eusebius* were nothing to the *Chronological Character of Phlegon himself^b*, now reviv'd by the *Defence* as the only one left, and just as *foreign and trifling as ever*. For we are not enquiring in the present Case, whether *Eusebius* applied *Phlegon* justly or not, but whether his quotation of him is clear and certain as to the reading. That it is so, I appeal to the other *Greek Writers* who cite *Phlegon*, and to the *Latin Writers* who translate *Eusebius*. The former shew plainly that he quoted *Phlegon* fairly, and the latter that his present *Greek Text* is the true one and that it is not to be altered as *Kepler*, *Dr. Sykes*, and others would have it.

To confirm all which, and to demonstrate

(*) Dissert. p. 45, 46.

(b) Ibid. p. 48.

that no Argument is to be drawn from the *Application* of an Author in *Eusebius* to the bare *quotation* of one, I will now give an Instance from that very passage of *Eusebius*, where *Phlegon* is produc'd by him. *Eusebius* does there cite *Josephus* as relating, that at a certain time* upon the Day of Pentecost the Priests perceiv'd first an Earthquake and Noise, and next heard a Voice like that of a Multitude from the innermost part of the Temple crying out in these words, let us depart hence. Now here 'tis allow'd *Eusebius* misapplies this Passage of *Josephus* in respect of Time, but yet he quotes it *exactly* as to *sense*, neither adding nor omitting any one word that was material. Some little Variations indeed there are, because he does not profess to recite the *very Words* of *Josephus*, as he does those of *Phlegon*; but they are very few and of no moment, neither favouring the *Application* of *Eusebius*, nor disguising the true sense of the Historian. Hence therefore you see, the *integrity* of *Eusebius* is secure, tho' he happens to err in *judgment*; he may be trusted very safely for the *words* of an Author, however he may mistake and misinterpret him. He did not wilfully misapply on purpose to deceive his Reader, or to serve a

(*) Κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς δὲ χρόνους Ἰωσήφος ἱστορεῖ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Πεντη-
 κστής, κινήσεως καὶ κτύπου ἱερίας ἀνπλαμυνάμεναι πρῶτον, ἔπειτα φωνῆς
 ἀθρόας ἤνδθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτοῖς ῥήματα εἰπύσης, Μετα-
 σταθῆναι ἡμεῖς. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 202. Ed. 1658. Conf.
 Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. vi. c. v. Ed. Haverc.

Cause; but for want sometimes of a due attention to the Author before him; which little defect Men of infinite reading, as he was, and conversant with such a vast variety of Authors and Subjects cannot always avoid, and may well be excused. But if one instance of this kind will not convince Dr. Sykes, and remove his Suspicions, I can easily refer him to several others, and particularly to some remarkable ones in *Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History*. In that Work among others we have two large extracts from *Philo* and *Josephus*; both which are misinterpreted and misapplied by *Eusebius*, and yet are both represented as to words with the greatest fidelity and exactness, as may appear to any one, that will compare the Authors themselves with the *Father's* citations of them†. To what purpose then is the Doctor's exception against *Eusebius* with regard to *Phlegon*? Since he not only *applies*, but *produces* the *very words* of that Writer, as he declares himself; and tho' he should be suppos'd to *misapply* him with respect to *Time*, which he certainly has not, yet his *literal quotation* of him may be justly depended upon. To me it seems as evident as any thing of this kind can be, that the *Greek* of *Phlegon* in *Eusebius* is genuine and clear as to the reading of it; and I must in-

(†) Vid. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. L. I. c. x. Conf. Joseph. Antiq. L. XVIII. c. 2. n. 2. Ed. Haverc. Id. ibid. L. II. c. xvii. p. 67. Ed. Cant. Conf. Philon. Vit. Contemplat. pag. 892. Ed. Par. 1641.

list very strongly upon it, that there is not the least room or colour for doubting it, whatever Dr. S. may pretend to the contrary.

AND now I take the liberty once more of asserting, that here are no less than *seven* ancient Writers all concurring in one uniform representation of a Fragment of *Phlegon*, and in one reading of a controverted Numeral, Out of which seven, *three* are *Greek* and *original* Testimonies in the highest sense, as they all appear without the least mark or form of *Transcribers*; and these alone to any reasonable Critick would be sufficient to ascertain the true reading of *Phlegon*. But besides these, we have also four *Latins*, who are all *additional Evidences* for me and against Dr. Sykes; for let them *translate* or *transcribe* never so much, they greatly *confirm* the Testimony of the others both by their *Translations* and *Transcripts*, and give a new weight and Authority to it. By one they fix the *Text* of *Eusebius* beyond dispute, and by the other they *attest* the truth and exactness of his quotation in not correcting and contradicting it, when they had it in their power. In this view, if no other, they are to us very useful and valuable; and as they manifestly increase our strength, must be added to our numbers by the Doctors leave, and esteem'd as serviceable auxiliaries.

VII.

HITHERTO I have been employed in resetting my *Foundations*, as the Doctor calls them, and I hope with pretty tolerable success, having oppos'd every attempt that has been made upon them, and guarded against every Blow that look'd formidable and threatned their Ruin. This done, I am to engage with the *Doctor's* Forces, which he thinks, are recover'd out of that little disorder, I had put them into before, and are prepared to make a stand and to keep their ground. He begins ^c with *Africanus*, from whom an Objection was drawn against the common reading of *Phlegon* after this manner. *Africanus* applied *Phlegon's* Eclipse to the Darkness at the Passion; now the Passion according to him was in the 15th of *Tiberius*, therefore he supposed that *Phlegon's* Eclipse was likewise in the 15th of *Tiberius*, and consequently read in *Phlegon* Ol. 201. 4. not Ol. 202. 4. This in short is the Sum and the whole strength of the Objection. In answer to which I observ'd ^d, that this was no positive and conclusive proof against the reading of *Phlegon* in *Eusebius*, because *Africanus* might apply *Phlegon's* Eclipse to the Darkness at the Passion either by mistake, for want of comparing critically the *Olympiads* with the years of *Tiberius*; Or,

^c) Sec. Def. p. 39. (d) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 26. — 32. because

because he might imagine, that *Phlegon* himself was mistaken in the year, as living so long after the time. And to make these Suppositions the more probable, I gave some Instances of such misapplications both in antient and modern Writers, with my Reasons for not admitting such indirect and conjectural Evidence against that which is positive and direct, arising from plain and express Quotations. Now what says the *Second Defence*? Why it will not be so rigorous and confident as the *Dissertation* was, it does not insist upon direct and necessary Consequences against us, but candidly allows either of the Cases I mentioned to be *possible*, without pretending to more than a *probable Conjecture* on his side. This is very humble and gracious, and makes full amends for some little Exceptions that are still remaining. For if *Africanus* might *possibly* misapply *Phlegon* for either of those Reasons, then certainly *Africanus* might *possibly* read *Phlegon* just as *Eusebius* did, and therefore he *proves* nothing directly and necessarily against *Eusebius*. Q. E. P. Dr. Sykes may perhaps reply, that *our* account of *Africanus* is only *possible*, but that *his* is most *probable* and natural. I grant, in other Circumstances it might be so, but it is not in the present. If *Africanus* stood alone, and no Authors had preserv'd the *very Words* of *Phlegon*, then indeed I should interpret *Africanus*, as the Doctor has done; because there would *appear* to me *then* no substantial Reason against it.

But

But in the present Case there is plain Evidence from exprefs Quotations against such an Interpretation of him, which renders it of no force and validity, and makes it the *least probable* of any. Cases of this kind often happen as to other Authors, and the rule which is constantly observ'd by Criticks in such Cases, and that with the greatest reason and judgment, as I said before, is to follow *exprefs* Quotations of Authors in opposition to any loose applications of them. Otherwise there would be endless confusion in old Writers, and the genuine Text would be lost in a monstrous variety of Glosses and Corruptions.

BUT 'tis farther objected with great Emphasis and Emotion, that *Africanus* is not the only Person concerned; but with him *Origen* and *Tertullian*, and all the old Christians, or very near all for above two hundred years together. For, it seems, *They all agreed in the same year, and apply Phlegon to that year*, which, says he, *is not conceivable if they all read Phlegon's words, as Eusebius afterwards published them.* This really is astonishing News to me. What! *All the old Christians, for above two hundred years together apply Phlegon to their year of the Passion!* For my part I know of no more than two before *Eusebius* that ever mention his Name, viz. *Africanus* and *Origen*; and I know of but one more, that may seem to allude to him, without naming him expressly, and that Person

is *Tertullian*. As to any others, I confess ingenuously, they are utter Strangers to me, and I never heard one tittle about them; being therefore at present quite in the dark as to them, I should be glad to be informed by Dr. S. where this troop of *Old Christians* and *Men of Literature* is to be found. In the mean time those *Christians* that are *visible* give me no disturbance; *Tertullian* has not a syllable about *Phlegon*, and 'tis a great doubt with me whether he ever *alludes* to him*; and as to *Origen*, Dr. S. sure of all Men has the least right or reason to cite him in this Case. For *Origen* in his *Latin Tractatus* so often urg'd and so much valued by the Doctor is silent as to *Phlegon*.

(*) I am sensible, that many Learned Men have suppos'd *Tertullian* to allude to *Phlegon* in that passage of his *Apology*, *Deliquium antiquè putaverunt, qui id quoque super Christo prædicatum non scierunt.* And 'tis no wonder, that they should interpret *Tertullian* after this manner, before the following Words were published by *Rigaltius*, *ratione non deprehensâ negaverunt.* But now these Words are added, there seems to be a strong Objection against making any allusion to *Phlegon*, because 'tis certain that he never denied the fact itself of the Darknes, as those Persons did of whom *Tertullian* speaks. Wherefore 'tis my Opinion, that *Tertullian* here means some captious Philosophers or Jews, who talked or wrote against the Christian accounts of the Passion after this manner; and I think that *Jerom* may direct us to such an Exposition of him. He says, *Qui scripserunt contra Evangelia, suspicantur deliquium solis, quod certis statutisque temporibus accidere solet, discipulos Christi ob imperitiam super resurrectione Domini interpretatos; quum defectus solis nunquam nisi ortu Lunæ fieri soleat.* Nulli autem dubium est, *Paschæ tempore Lunam fuisse plenissimam.* Comm. in *Matt.* Lib. 4. cap. 28. If the Reader will compare this Passage of *Jerom* with *Tertullian* here and *Origen* on the same Chapter of *St. Matthew*, he will find it a proper Key to both. See also *Phlegon examined* &c. p. 83, 84.

and all other *Historians*, allowing that not one of them ever mentions the Darknes at the Passion. And in his *Greek Work* against *Celsus* he *treats* the *Evidence* of *Phlegon* so negligently in the Doctor's Opinion, that Dr. S. must be the last Man that can lay any stress upon it, or think it worth notice. However if he does admit it here to serve a present turn, I may tell him from himself^a, that *what one or two do, may easily be ascrib'd to inadvertency, forgetfulness, or any other Cause.* So that for the present at least my first *solution* may stand pretty secure; how far it would hold against greater Numbers, it may be time enough to consider when those Numbers appear.

NEITHER was my second Supposition about the same Writer *Africanus* more groundless in itself, tho' Dr. S. pronounces it to be so, and is sure *it can influence no one's Assent*^b. As it is allow'd to be possible, so in this Case it was even probable; because the *Circumstances* of *Phlegon's* Eclipse being very extraordinary might lead *Africanus* to think it the same with the Darknes at the Passion, tho' plac'd by *Phlegon* in a different year. And to confirm this Supposition, I produc'd a parallel Instance from the *Historia Miscella* in this very Case about *Phlegon*^c. To all which the short and easy reply is, That I *palliate the Faults of Africanus* by the *Absurdities* of another Writer; as

(a) Sec. Def. p. 31. (b) Ibid. p. 35.

(c) *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 31, 32.

if either the *quality* of an Action would disprove the Action itself, or every such application of Writers were *absurd* and indefensible in all Cases and at all Times: Whereas the Doctor must know, that 'tis frequently practis'd by our *modern* Chronologers, and even much commended and admir'd in *them*. They often are determined, as *Africanus* might be in this Case, by particular *Circumstances* of Facts, to neglect the *date* of those Facts assigned by some Historians, and to apply them to other Times. Why therefore must any Supposition of this kind with regard to *Africanus* be rejected as entirely *groundless* and extravagant?

As to the next Exception under this Article, it is of very small consequence, and may soon be dispatched. To shew the fallacy and unreasonableness of the Doctor's way of arguing from *Africanus*, I was willing to give an Instance or two of the *ill Uses* that might be made of it as to other Authors. One of which was taken from *Eusebius* against *Josephus*, the other from some primitive Writers against St. *John's* Gospel^d. Now these Instances are much disliked and censur'd by the *Defence*^e as not being parallel to the Case of *Phlegon* in every minute Circumstance. As if it was absolutely necessary, that Comparisons and Parallels should run upon all fours, or agree exactly in every particular. It is always sufficient, if they only agree in the main Points, or those in which

(d) Ibid. p. 27, 28.

(e) Sec. Def. p. 33, 34.

the parallel is formed ; and as to these, I still maintain, that the Instances I produced were just and pertinent, and were similar enough to prove, that bare *Applications* of Writers afford no solid Argument against the plain *Text* of such Writers. Let *Eusebius*, as I there represented him, stand only in the place of *Africanus*, applying *Josephus* to a wrong time, as *Africanus* does one of *Phlegon*. Here I say, if the bare *Application* of *Phlegon* by *Africanus* proves any thing against the plain *Text* of *Phlegon*, exhibited in the Original Words by other Writers, then by parity of reason the bare Application of *Josephus* by *Eusebius* would prove as much against the Text of *Josephus* exhibited in our present Editions. The stress of the Argument in both Cases lies in the *Application* of those Authors, and if such *Application* has any force in the former, it must likewise have the same in the latter. Whether the *Text* of the Writer be a Fragment or not, makes little or no alteration, so long as we are furnished with the *Text* itself. It is enough, if that appears in the *original Words*, either by credible Authors that quote them, or by antient MSS. representing them. But to make the Case of *Josephus* exactly parallel with that of *Phlegon*. Suppose the passage of *Josephus* now under debate to have been only a Fragment as that of *Phlegon* is, preserv'd like the other in the same form by several antient Writers, professing to exhibit

exhibit the *very Words* of that Author. I would ask any judicious Critick, whether the bare *Application* of that Passage by *Eusebius* would have any weight with him against the *Words* of *Josephus* himself thus preserv'd to his hands by other Writers. If it would not, as I am fully persuaded it would not, then for the same Reasons the *Application* of *Phlegon* by *Africanus* would have as little weight with him against the *Words* of *Phlegon* himself, preserved to us in the same form by *Eusebius*, *Chronicon Paschale* &c.

WHAT has been here said is equally applicable to my second Instance of *St. John's Gospel*, and by only changing the terms will fully explain and vindicate that too as well as the former. I shall not therefore trouble the Reader with any needless Repetitions, but go on to another Article, in which the Doctor and I disagree about *Africanus*. It relates to that Author's irregular representation of *Phlegon's Words*. I offer'd what appear'd to me^f the most easy and natural way of accounting for it; and which Dr. S. is pleas'd to term an *ingenious and handsome Apology*. But yet he has this to say against it, *That those Men, whom Origen stiles the Sapientes hujus mundi, understood very probably this Passage of Africanus not as Mr. Ch. has accounted for it. Nor did Origen in answer to them attempt to say that was no-*

(f) *Phlegon examined* &c. p. 37 — 41.

thing

thing but Africanus's interpretation of Phlegon's or account for Phlegon's Expressions in this manner, notwithstanding his Friend and intimate Acquaintance Africanus had done this before him^s. After all this long Story from Origen, the Reader, I believe, will be much surpriz'd, when I tell him, that neither Origen nor his *Sapientes hujus mundi* say one tittle about Africanus or his Citation of Phlegon. 'Tis a mere fiction of the Doctor's, grounded I suppose on two or three words of Origen, which have no such mystical meaning, as he would strike out of them. The Pagans are introduc'd by that Writer as saying among other things, *How is it that only your own Writers have taken notice of this extraordinary Darknes?* Phlegon indeed in his *Chronicles* has wrote of a Darknes in the Reign of Tiberius Cæsar, but he has not signified that it happened at full Moon^h. Now here because the Pagans say, Phlegon has not signified that his Darknes happened at full Moon, therefore the Doctor fancies, they hint at Africanus, who represented Phlegon's Eclipse as happening at full Moon. But could not they say this against the Christian Doctrine of a preternatural Darknes happening at full Moon, when Jesus was crucified: tho' Africanus had never represented Phlegon in this manner? Or could they not very

(g) Sec. Def. p. 37.

(h) Phlegon quidem in *Chronicis* suis scripsit, in Principatu Tiberii Cæsaris factum, sed non significavit in Lunâ plenâ hoc factum. Origen. *Tractat. in Matt.* 35. p. 200. Ed. Basil.

properly make this Answer to some *Christians* quoting *Phlegon* in confirmation of the Gospel-History, tho' they did not pretend to any *full Moon* in *Phlegon*? Most certainly they might, and therefore *Africanus* may fairly be out of the question. Besides I have more Objections than one against this Supposition. If the *Pagans* had really any view to *Africanus*, they would not have screen'd him under a distant *innuendo*, but would have published his Name, and exclaimed loudly against his Misrepresentations. For the *Pagans* were not tender of a *Christian's* Character, nor apt to wink at any Faults they could discern in their Adversaries, nor backward to take any handle that might give them an advantage. How then comes it to pass, that *Africanus* should here escape under a gentle hint, without any complaints of his Conduct, when an open Charge against him would have strengthened their Objection exceedingly, and perplex'd the common *Christians*, with whom they were engag'd? Again farther. To turn *Origen* himself against the Doctor, if *Origen* had understood them as hinting at his Friend *Africanus*, (which whether they did or no, he must certainly understand, as 'tis *he* that makes them speak in this manner) he would surely have dropt something about *his Friend* in his Answer to the *Pagans*, and not pass'd him over in a profound Silence, as we see he does. This is quite improbable, and cannot be suppos'd
with

with any Reason. Leaving therefore all this fine Speculation about *Origen* and his *Wise Men*, I pass on to another Objection, that is much more acute and plausible. We find it among the *errata* thus express'd. *Tho' the Words* ἐν παντελήνῳ *might be possibly inserted by* *Africanus*, yet *those other explanatory Words* μέχρις ὧρας *could not. For no Language will admit this manner of Expression, that there was a total Eclipse from such an hour, without the mention of the hour, To which it lasted. That is, no Language will admit, that those two extremities of Time From and To shou'd ever be separated, but that where the first is express'd, there the last must be so too; and consequently* ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἕως ἑκτῆς *in* *Africanus* *could not stand alone without* *με-* *χρις ὧρας*, *but must both or neither be attributed to* *Phlegon*. In answer to which I must tell the Doctor, that he's greatly mistaken in *Languages* as to this Point; for tho' *modern* and *living* *Languages* may not admit such construction, the *old* and *dead* ones will without any difficulty. The Preposition *à* in *Latin* and *ἀπὸ* in *Greek*, when joyn'd to Words of Time as *Hour, Day, Morning, Noon, Night &c.* do not always express the *duration* of a Thing, or the *distance* between one point of Time and another, but sometimes the bare *rise* or *beginning* of a Thing; and then they require no corresponding Particles as *ad, usque ad, &c.* *μέχρις &c.* Instances of this kind are not very
uncom-

uncommon. Thus *Aratus* speaking of the *Ursa major*

Φαινομένη Ελίχη πρώτης ΑΠΟ νυκτός;
Juvenal. Sat. I. v. 49.

Exul ab octava Marius bibit.

Cicero Philipp. II. c. 41. Ab *Horâ tertiâ bibe-*
batur, ludebatur.

And perhaps the Preposition *ἀπὸ* is to be understood in that Passage of *Ptolemy*, where he gives an account from some ancient Writer of a Lunar Eclipse observ'd in *Babylon*, Εξέλιπε δὲ Φησιν, ἀπὸ νύτῃ δακτύλης τρεῖς, αὐτῇ δὲ μεσονυκτίῃ. (i. e. ἀπ' αὐτῇ.) *Almag. L. 3. pag. 95.* So likewise the *Hebrew prefix* מ answering to the *Latin à* has sometimes the same signification, as Gen. XIX. 34. *It came to pass Mim-máhharith* מִמָּחָר, which we translate not from but on the morrow: Tho' the literal Translation of it is *à crastino*, as *Pagninus* renders it in our Polyglott. But to clear up the matter beyond dispute, I will now give the Doctor an Instance, where the very words objected ἀπὸ ἑκτῆς ὥρας are us'd without any redditive at all. In the *Chronicon Paschale* we have this passage, after speaking of *Christ our true Passover's being sacrific'd*, Καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος εἰς ὅλον τὸ κόσμον ΑΠΟ ἑκτῆς ὥρας. Περὶ δὲ σκοτίας ὧς*. Here you see is a *From* without any *To* subjoyn'd, and in the very case of an Eclipse about which we are now debating. I hope therefore *Languages*

(*) *Chronicon Pasch. p. 219. Ed. Par.*

will now be allow'd to *admit* such Expressions, and 'twill be evident sufficiently, that $\delta\pi\acute{o}$ τῆς ἑκτῆς ὥρας in *Africanus* might well enough be disjoyned from $\mu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ἐνάτης, without doing violence to the *Greek* Language; in which situation indeed, $\alpha\pi\acute{o}$ would not properly signify *from*, but *at* or *upon the sixth* hour. However after all, this is more than my Argument obliges me to prove; for since *Africanus* does not pretend to give us *Phlegon's* Words, but only makes a report from him in the way of Abstract, he might easily be suppos'd to alter in some measure *Phlegon's phrase* about the time, tho' his *sense* was still preserv'd entire. So that $\delta\pi\acute{o}$ ἑκτῆς ὥρας would immediately be understood as standing for some *equivalent* Expression in *Phlegon*, and put there in preference to the other by *Africanus*, as suiting best with his own $\mu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ἐνάτης. Whether a *From* would require a *To* in strict propriety of Language, would not here be consider'd by the Reader; and any critical and laborious Enquiry about it would be altogether needless and superfluous. It is time therefore to conclude this Article of *Africanus*, and I shall only add my wishes of all the comfort and pleasure to the Doctor, which my Phrase of *ten years* can afford him under so many difficulties and distresses.

VIII.

THE next Writer to be consider'd is *Origen*, whose sense in one Passage of his *Latin Works* is the principal Point in dispute. I am sensible how tedious and disagreeable such an Article must be to a Reader, and shall therefore contract it into as narrow a compass as possible. The whole Passage is fairly laid before him in the Margin^a, by which he may easily judge of the several reasonings upon it. Dr. *Sykes* in the first place *denies*^b, that he *had put the words*

(a) Quidam calumniantur evangelicam veritatem, dicentes, quomodo secundum textum potest esse verum quod dicitur, quia *facta sunt tenebra super omnem terram, à sextâ horâ usque ad nonam*: quod *factum* nulla refert historia. Et dicunt, quia sicut fieri solet in Solis defectione, sic *facta* est tunc *defectio* Solis. Defectio autem Solis à seculo semper fuit in suo tempore *facta*; sed defectio Solis quæ secundum consuetudinem temporum ita currentium fieri solet, non in alio tempore fit nisi in conventu Solis & Lunæ, quando Luna subtus currens Solis impedit radios occurrentes ei, & cursu suo lumen ejus obtundit. In tempore autem, quo passus est Christus, manifestum est quoniam conventus non erat Lunæ ad Solem, quoniam tempus erat Paschale, quod consuetudinis est agere quando Luna Solis plenitudinem habet, & in totâ est nocte. Quomodo ergo poterat fieri defectio Solis, cum Luna esset plena, & plenitudinem Solis haberet? Quia (f. Quidam) autem credentium volentes defensionem aliquam introducere contra *hac*, ita dixerunt. Cum constet cætera prodigia, quæ tunc *facta* sunt, non secundum consuetudinem *facta* fuisse sed nova & admiranda; nam & velum Templi &c. — manifestum est quoniam & illa defectio Solis consequenter secundum cætera prodigia nova contra consuetudinem *facta* est. Origen. Tractat. in Matt. XXXV. pag. 199, 200. Ed. Basil.

(b) Sec. Def. p. 41.

of Origen into the Mouth of the Pagans, as I had represented him. But he only *denies* it, without disproving my *Reasons* for imputing to him such a mistake; which therefore are still in their full force, and oblige me to maintain the same Opinion. The *Pagans* are evidently introduc'd by *Origen* as alledging, that at the Passion of our Saviour there was just such a *Defectio* or *Eclipse* of the *Sun* as usually happens at other times. *Dicunt, quia sicut fieri solet in Solis Defectione, sic facta est tunc Defectio Solis.* In the very next words we have a long and convincing Argument to prove, that a *common* or *natural* Eclipse of the Sun could *not* happen at the time of the Passion, the Moon being then at full. This whole Argument I attribute to *Origen* himself, but Dr. S. assigns it to the *Pagans*; which as I apprehend, is making them talk very foolishly and inconsistently. For as they had just before asserted, that the Darkness at the Passion was only a common Eclipse, how could they with any tolerable sense or propriety argue in the next words, that it *was not* and *could not* be a *common Eclipse*? This sort of reasoning in *them* would be mere jargon and contradiction, but in *Origen* a sound and proper Answer for the *Christians*. To him therefore I think it solely belongs; and what confirms me very much in this Opinion is the Passage of *Jerom* produc'd above *, where the Reader may

(*) See above p. 41. Not.

observe the same Cavil to be started by the Enemies of Christianity, and the same Answer returned to it by *Jerom* himself. As to the *connective Particles*, which are urg'd by Dr. S. as *plainly shewing* my mistake, I might safely trust them with every Scholar; it being plain and obvious to any one, that *autem*, which is the only *connective Particle* in this place, is often an *adversative Conjunction*, or else denotes a transition from one Thing or *Person* to another. A clear proof of which Dr. S. might easily have seen in this very Passage of *Origen*. For when he tells us the Answer, that other *Christians* us'd to make to this Objection of the *Pagans*, he introduces it with *Quia* (f. *Quidam*) *autem credentium volentes &c.* Why therefore may not *autem* change the *Person* in the other Sentences, as well as it does here? Why may not *Origen* himself speak in those words *Defectio autem Solis &c.* and, *In tempore autem quo passus est Christus &c.* as well as he does in *Quia autem credentium volentes &c.* The *Particle* is the same in all, and the last *autem* might as justly have been distinguish'd with *Capitals* by the Doctor as the two former; only then indeed it might be too much *distinguished*, and would have spoil'd the significancy of the others, and for that Reason obscurity and *small Letters* became it best.

THE second Exception^d about *Origen* re-

(c) See. Def. p. 42.

(d) Ibid.

lates to the *silence* of *Historians* objected by the *Pagans*. I had said^e, that the *silence* of *Historians* which they mean, and upon which they ground their *Objection*, was a *silence* as to the particular *Circumstances* of the *Darkness*, the extraordinary *Nature* of it, the *Place*, the *Week*, and *Day* upon which it happened. And finding that these particulars were not minutely specified by any *Heathen Historians*, they boldly denied, that such *Historians* confirmed any *Facts* of the *Gospel*. To which it is replied by the *Defence*^f, that the *Objection* is not taken from a *silence* about the *Circumstances*, but the whole *Fact*. It is the *Factum*, the thing itself, which they say no *History* ever mentions. No doubt of it, it was so; and who ever denied it? What I say is, that the Reason why the *Pagans* objected a *silence* of *Historians* as to the *Fact*, was because they found a *silence* among them of the particular *Circumstances* attending that *Fact*. *Phlegon* and *Thallus* and other *Historians* might really take notice of the *Darkness* at the *Passion*; but because they did not specify minutely the particular *Circumstances* of their *Darkness* or *Eclipse*, the *Place*, the *Time*, and *Age* of the *Moon*, therefore the *Pagans* denied that any mention was made of such *Darkness* by their *Writers*. Thus we see in the Case of *Phlegon*, they except against his *Testimony*, because tho' he had written of an *Eclipse* in the *Reign* of *Tiberius*

(e) *Phlegon* examined p. 46. (f) *Sec. Def.* p. 44.

in a certain year of Ol. 202. yet he had not signified that his Eclipse happened at *Full-Moon*: For want of which Circumstance, they, it seems, would not allow him to speak any thing of the *Gospel-Fact*. And for want of the same particularity and exactness they would evade and reject any other Authority, that might be urged. Neither indeed were *they* much to blame in this respect, it being necessary in Appeals to Antiquity about *Facts*, to judge of those *Facts* by the Circumstances annex'd. Nor do I wonder, that *Origen* does not *answer this Objection by distinguishing between the Eclipse and the Circumstances of it*; since such a Distinction in *him* would not really *answer the Objection*. For how could *He* prove to them, that *Phlegon* by his Eclipse meant the Darkness at the Passion, when *Phlegon* had not mentioned the time of the Year, nor Day of the Month when his Eclipse happened, nor so much as the Duration of it? This was a Difficulty, that might well discourage *Origen* from claiming his Authority at that Time, and determine him to take another way of *answering the Objection*. But what does all this prove against me or *Phlegon* in the present Dispute? Not a single tittle. Neither *Pagans* nor *Origen* say a word about the *reading of Phlegon*, whether it was Ol. 202. 1. or Ol. 202. 4. Their debate did not turn upon the *year of that Olympiad*, as *ours* does now; nor could it ever be determined by it. For
which-

whichever was the true *year* of *Phlegon's* Eclipse, the same Objections would still recur, that here was no distinct Enumeration of particular Circumstances, no mention of an Eclipse at *Full Moon*, of its being preternatural, and lasting with the same degree of Darkness for three Hours. So that let the *year* of this Eclipse be what it will, they would not be convinc'd by *that* alone, that *Phlegon* was speaking of the Darkness in the Gospel. Whereas the Point in dispute between me and Dr. S. is the *year* of *Phlegon's* Eclipse; and if that appears to be the *fourth* of Ol. 202. Dr. *Sykes* allows, that *Phlegon* must speak of the Darkness at the Passion, and not of a *natural Eclipse*. It was proper therefore and necessary for me to shew, that the *Pagan's* Objection from the *silence* of *Phlegon* and other Historians was not grounded on the *year* of his Eclipse, but on the want of more *particular Circumstances*: and for this Reason I observ'd, their Objection would be of little service to the Doctor's Argument.

H O W E V E R, let *Origen* say what he will in this *Latin Tractatus*, he does himself destroy all the Force of it entirely, by what he declar'd afterwards in his Books against *Celsus*. There he plainly appeals to the Testimony of *Phlegon**; and as this Work of his is certainly genuine, still extant in the Original *Greek*, and allow'd to be the most exact and finish'd Piece

(*) See *Phlegon* examined &c. p. 49, 50.

he ever wrote, by this we ought in reason to be determin'd in our judgment of *Origen*. As to the Doctor's Exceptions against the *Greek Origen*, the most material being now dropped, and the few that remain being old ones reviv'd with no new strength, I shall venture to let them stand unmolested. Only one Observation of his I must not omit, because of the curious Criticism express'd in it. Dr. S. informs me that *ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ* or merely *ἐν χρόνῳ* would have been more definitive of the Time, than the *κατὰ τὸν χρόνον* of *Origen*, which, the Doctor will excuse me, if I cannot apprehend without his Reasons for it. But what is still more remarkable, even *αὐτὸς* is made a *Preposition*, if 'tis meant as an Answer to me. For I desir'd Dr. S. to let me know, what *Greek Preposition* was more proper to express at the time than *κατὰ*; to which the Doctor now answers, that I cannot but know, there are many ways of expressing that. Suppose he had said *κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν χρόνον* or *ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ* &c. Where the natural Construction of the two Sentences should either make *αὐτὸν* a *Preposition*, or else nothing to the purpose.

IX.

I now proceed to consider, what Dr. Sykes has urg'd against me in relation to the Word

H

Εχλευς

Εκλειψις. He seems by his silence to acknowledge, that it *might* be used of an extraordinary Darkness tho' not strictly *Ecliptical*, and tacitly allows my general Arguments on that head, This alone is sufficient for my purpose, which was only to shew that the Word Εκλειψις in *Phlegon* does not necessarily signify a proper Eclipse, as the Doctor at first asserted. Whether I have succeeded with *Aristophanes* and his *Scholiast* or not, is a Point that very little concerns *Phlegon*, he being still secure by other Authorities whatever becomes of this last. However even this I shall venture to defend, being still persuaded that many good Reasons will support me in it. *Aristophanes* with a great deal of humour introduces the *Clouds* speaking thus to the *Athenians*.

Εἶτα τ' θεοῖσιν ἐχθρόν βυρσοδέψην Παφλαγῶνα
ΗΝΙΧ' ΗΡΕΙΣΘΕ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΝ, τὰς ὀφρῦς
συνήρομεν,

Καὶ ποιεῖμεν δεινά· βροντὴ δ' ἐρράβη δι' ἀστραπῆς.
Ἡ σελήνη δ' ἐξέλιπέ γε τὰς ὁδοὺς· ὁ δ' Ἥλιος
τὴν θρυαλλίδ' εἰς αὐτὸν ΕΥΘΕΩΣ συνεκλύσας
οὐ φανεῖν ἔφασκεν ὑμῖν, εἰ στρατηγήσει Κλέων.

Nub. v. 581. seq.

Here you observe, the *Clouds* are said to contract their brows and do terrible Things, Thunder Rattles and Lightnings Flame in the Air, and the Moon leaves her usual Course, when the Παφλαγῶν i. e. Cleon was elected General, ἡνίχ' ἡρεῖσθε στρατηγόν. Now 'tis certain that
Cleon

Cleon was elected General by the Athenians on the *νεμηνία* or the 1st Day of the Month, that being the stated Time for these Elections*; and consequently that all these dismal Things happened according to *Aristophanes* at that very Time or immediately before it. Let us see now what the *Scholiast* says to this Passage. Upon these Words *Ἡ σελήνη δ' ἐξέλιπε γὰρ τὰς ὁδοὺς* he comments thus. *ΕΠΕΙΔΗ Ε-κλειψίς ἐγένετο Σελήνης τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτη ἐπὶ Στρατοκλέους Βοηδρομίῳνι. Because an Eclipse of the Moon happened the former Year (i. e. Year before the Clouds were acted Ol. 88. 4.) in the Month Boedromion when Stratocles was Archon. What other meaning can be given to these Words of the Scholiast with any propriety or pertinency but this, that there happened an Eclipse of the Moon at that Time, when Aristophanes makes the Moon to leave her usual Course? And what other time can this be, but that when Cleon was elected General? If you suppose the Eclipse in the Scholiast to have happened at any other time very distant from the former, his Comment becomes egregiously trifling and impertinent. Besides, the Word *Επειδή* has no tolerable Sense upon such a Supposition; for how strange would it sound, that the Moon in *Aristo-**

(*) *Aristophan. Equit. v. 43.*

ἕως (δήμος) τῇ προτέρῃ νεμηνίᾳ

Ετρίατο δούλοι, βοροσθέν Πάφλαγόνι.

Εν ταῖς νεμηνίαις οἱ δούλοι ἐπωλῶντο, καὶ οἱ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΙ ἐχαιροῦντο. Schol. vet. in loc.

phanes left her usual Course in September, because there happened an *Eclipse* of the Moon in October following? For my part I cannot easily believe that so Learned and Judicious a Writer as this *Scholiast* is, would comment so absurdly. Dr. *Sykes* however is of another Opinion, and says, 'tis plain, that he meant a real natural *Eclipse* of the Moon^a. For a Lunar *Eclipse*, it seems, there was in fact that Year, viz. Ol. 88. 4. upon the ninth of October, and the 6th of the Attic Month *Boedromion*. I grant the Moon was at that time *Ecliptical*, tho' not in the Month *Boedromion*, as I shall prove hereafter; but we know it to be so not from *antient* History and Observation, but only from *modern* Calculations and Tables. *Thucydides* who liv'd at the very time when this *Eclipse* is said to have happened, and takes particular notice of several other *Eclipses* during the long *Peloponnesian* War, does not mention a syllable of this, nor any other *antient* Writer that we know of*. It is therefore very probable, that no proper *Eclipse* was observed at this time by the Old *Athenians*, and that the *Scholiast* himself never heard of any such. Besides as 'tis evident from what has been said above, that the *Scholiast* refers his *Eclipse* to the Civil *year* or the 1st Day of the Month, he could not imagine any proper *Eclipse* of the Moon to have happened at that time without the grossest Ignorance in A-

(a) Sec. Def. p. 57. (*) Vid. Petav. Doctrin. Temp.
L. 8. Ricciol. Almagest. L. V. c. xix. Astronomy,

stronomy. such an Ignorance as *he* could not be guilty of, who liv'd when that Science was cultivated with great success, and made a principal part of the Studies of all Learned Men. He must likewise suppose the *Civil ῥημνία* to coincide with the *Astronomical*, or at least not to vary much from it, since the *Attic Months* were all known to be *Lunar*, and 'twas plain from *Thucydides* and other Writers, that Eclipses of the Sun had been observed to fall upon or near the *Civil ῥημνία* in the *Attic Months**, which they could not do, if the *Attic Months* had not then corresponded with pretty great exactness to the natural Conjunctions of Sun and Moon. From all which laid together I cannot but conclude, that the *Greek Scholiast* meant no proper Eclipse by his *Ἐκλειψις*, but only an accidental *obscuratio* of the *Moon* occasioned by Clouds and Storms, as *Aristophanes* represented it.

NEITHER was I much mistaken, as the Doctor thinks, in saying that the Month *Boedromion* answers to our *September* and *October*. For so it did in every common year throughout *Meton's Cycle*, as may be seen in *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, *Salmasius*, *Spanheim*, and *Dodwell*†.

(*) Vid. *Dodwell. de Cycl. Veter. Diff.* I. §. 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28.

(†) *Joseph. Scalig. Emendat. Temp. L. II. p. 80.*
Petavius Doctrin. Temp. L. II. p. 123.
Dodwell. Cycl. Vet. p. 716.
Salmas. in Selin. p. 527.
Ezech. Spanhem. Chronolog. Joseph. p. 407. Append. ad Joseph. Ed. Haverc.

It's regular and usual situation therefore was in those two *Julian* Months; and so it was in the old *Attic* year immediately preceding *Meton's* Cycle. 'Tis true that in the *intercalary* Years *Boedromion* did answer to *August* and *September*, but that was not it's proper situation, nor what I intended in speaking of it. I only gave a short hint to the Reader of that particular correspondency which the *Attic* Month generally bore to the *Julian*, without considering minutely how it might stand in the years of intercalation; because then it would of course be remov'd out of its proper place; and to observe that occasional irregularity was not necessary to the Point in hand. But now since the Doctor has undertaken to prove my account quite wrong in this Article, and asserts that *Boedromion* begun *October* the 4th in Ol. 88. 4. I'm oblig'd to enlarge a little upon the *Attic* year, and must return the Compliment of an Error upon the Doctor. He says^b, *That year viz. Ol. 88. 4. began August the 5th*. But this is not true on any Supposition. For if *Meton's decennial Cycle* was not then brought into Civil Use, the *Attic* year did not begin in Summer but in Winter, in the Month *Gamelion*; it being fully demonstrated by the Learned *Dodwell*^c, that till *Meton's* time the

(b) Sec. Def. p. 59.

(c) Primus Meton civilis anni initium ab illo, quod postea obtinuit, solstitio æstivo deduxit, antea scilicet à brumâ inire so-
Civil

Civil year of the *Athenians* begun from the Winter-Solstice. Hence those lines of *Festus Avienus*.

— *Primava Meton exordia sumpsit ab anno,
Torreret rutilo cum Phæbus sidere Cancrum.*

Arat. v. 1371.

But on the other side if *Meton's Cycle* was brought into use at that time, the *Attic* year Ol. 88. 4. begun *June* 29. according to *Peta-vius* and *Dodwell's Tables*^d, or *Jun.* 28. according to *Scaliger's*^e. So that what *Dr. Sykes* lays down from *Calvisius* about *August* the *Vib* can be true neither way. And indeed *Calvisius* himself, whom the Doctor follows, overthrows by a strange inconsistency his own Hypothesis. For he expressly asserts^f, that *Meton's Cycle* was receiv'd by the *Greeks* as soon as ever it was propos'd; and places the reception of it in the year before the *Peloponnesian* War Ol. 87. 1. And yet in *Olymp.* 88. 4. eight years after this does he fix the beginning of the *Attic*

liti. ——— E quibus omnibus facile colligimus *Metoni primo novum* illud anni initium esse tribuendum. *Dodwell. Cycl. Vet. Diff. I. §. iv. p. 8. Conf. Diff. III. §. 34. p. 182.*

Rectè Viri Doctissimi censent Græcos vetustiores à *brumâ* annum exorsos, *Gamelione* Mense primo *Atheniensium*, ante *Periodum Metonicam*, & ante fixum in *Hecatombæone* Caput. *Freder. Spanhem. F. F. Chronolog. Sac. P. I. c. v. Scalig. Emend. Temp. L. II. p. 75.*

(d) Vid. *Dodwell. ubi sup. p. 716.*

Petav. Doctrin. Temp. L. II. p. 123.

(e) *Jos. Scalig. Emend. Temp. L. II. p. 80.*

(f) In usu fuit apud Græcos ab eo tempore, quo proposita fuit, quod accidit anno antequam *Bellum Peloponnesiacum* iniretur. *Calvis. Prolegom. p. 68. b. Chronic. p. 252. IV*

year

year in *August* the *Vth*, which is certainly false and irreconcilable with *Meton's Cycle*.

THUS much being prov'd against Dr. Sykes, what he says about the month *Boedromion* must inevitably fall to the ground of course. For if the *Attic* year did not begin *Aug. Vth. Ol. 88. 4. Boedromion*, as he very well knows, could not begin *October 4th*, nor could his *Lunar Eclipse* fall upon the *6th* of that Month. And farther, as *Meton's Cycle* was introduc'd by this time among the *Athenians*, as his own Author allows and Mr. Dodwell^g has largely prov'd, it is clear that *Boedromion* began that year (being the *8th* of *Meton's Cycle* and intercalary^h) *Aug. 27th* and ended *Septemb. 24*. By which means 'tis remov'd a considerable distance from the *natural Eclipse Octob. 9*. and makes it still more probable, that the *Scholiast's* *Εκλειψις* in *Boedromion* had no reference to the other, which happened six Weeks later. I grant indeed that the *Scholiast* might possibly mistake a Month, being fallible and subject to Error as well as other Men; but when so many Reasons concur to shew, that he had no *natural Eclipse* of the *Moon* in his Eye, 'twould be hard to charge him with any great mistake about the time of it.

NEITHER am I much better satisfied as to the *Sun*, tho' Dr. S. informs me, that there

(g) Dodwell. Cycl. Vet. Dissert. I. & III. §. 35.

(h) Vid. Ibid. p. 48, 716.

really was a *natural Eclipse* of the *Sun* in the same *Olympiadic year* on *March* the 21st. For that I was fully apprised of before, and had previously consider'd the Objection arising from thence, but could not allow it so much weight, as the Doctor has given to it. *Aristophanes* in the same place represents the *Sun* likewise as withdrawing his *Light*,

Τὴν Ἡριανίδα' εἰς ἑαυτὸν ΕΥΘΕΩΣ συναλκύσας,
and threatening not to appear, if *Cleon* should be chosen General,

Οὐ Φανεῖν ἔφασκεν ὑμῖν, εἰ στρατηγὸς Κλέων,
From whence 'tis plain, that the *Sun* withdrew his *Light* before *Cleon* was actually elected; for how could he threaten in order to discourage the *Athenians* from electing him, after the Election was past? And farther. As the *Sun* is made to threaten in this manner, so, no doubt, he was to execute what he threatned, and that soon after the Election was over, both to shew his Displeasure at the Choice, and discourage the *Athenians* from persisting in it. Otherwise all the Wit and Humour of the Poet in this Representation had been lost, and would be quite flat and insipid. Accordingly the *Schooliast* explains him to this Sense, *not*, says he, as if the *Sun* was already eclips'd, but threatening to be so, if *Cleon* should be elected General; and then subjoyns the Controverted Words, Ηλίου δὲ ἐγένετο κατὰ πινὰ τύχην Ἐκλειψὶς Κλέωνος χειροτονημένῃ. Now there did happen by some accident

an *Eclipse of the Sun upon Cleon's being elected*. Here the Dispute between me and Dr. Sykes is, whether that Εκλειψις of the *Scholiast* means one that happened *immediately* after *Cleon* was elected, or one that happened full *six Months* after. The former Interpretation to me, I confess, seems still the most probable, and that I beg leave to maintain for the following reasons. 1st. The Words Κλέωνος χειροτονούμενος most naturally express the *very Time* when *Cleon* was elected. For the Word χειροτονούμενος properly signifies nothing more than the *Election* itself of *Cleon* into the office of στρατηγός or *General*, and does not carry us beyond the *Time* when the *Election* was made: Whereas if the *Scholiast* had designed to intimate at large, that this Εκλειψις happened *during Cleon's στρατηγία*, he would, I think, have rather us'd the Word στρατηγέυτος, which is more extensive than the other, and is the term commonly used by the Antients upon such Occasions. So *Thucydides*, Περικλῆες ὃ Ξανθίππῳ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΥΝΤΟΣ. L. II. c. 31. So the *Scholiast* on *Aristophanes's Equites* v. 55. Βρυσίδου ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΥΝΤΟΣ. 2^d. Κατά πῃνα τύχην is more properly referr'd to some *accidental obscuratio* of the Sun either upon or near the Day of this *Election*, than to a regular Astronomical *Eclipse* at the distance of several Months from it. For there would be nothing particular and extraordinary in this, nothing but what had frequently happened,
when

when other Men of the best Character were chosen *Generals*. Whereas this is observ'd as something remarkable and peculiar to *Cleon*. 3. If the *Scholiast* had meant the *natural* Eclipse of the Sun, that happened in the Spring following, he would in all probability have mentioned the *Month*, in which it happened, as he mentioned *Boedromion* before in the *Lunar* Eclipse. For that was easily known to him from *Thucydides*, and was likewise very proper to be express'd in a Comment, to prevent Obscurity and Misinterpretation of the Fact. But if he be understood as speaking of some *accidental obscuratio* of the Sun when *Cleon* was elected, then 'tis easy to account for his silence in this respect, because the time of that accident had been intimated and was known already. 4. Another Argument in my favour is, I think, the great incongruity and impropriety that manifestly attends the Doctor's Interpretation. For according to this the *Sun* is by the *Scholiast* made to *threaten* an *Eclipse* if *Cleon* should be elected; and yet after he is elected, not to suffer any *Eclipse* for the space of six Months, and then at last to be eclips'd only in the ordinary and *natural* way. Which in my Opinion makes a very dull and trifling Sense of it, and such as no *Scholiast* of any Taste and Judgment would put upon *Aristophanes*. For these reasons therefore I am still of Opinion, that the *Scholiast* by his *Εκλειψις* did not mean any

I 2

real

real and *natural Eclipse*, but such an *Obscuratio* of the Sun happening soon *after Cleon's Election*, as had happened according to *Aristophanes* just *before* it, that is, occasion'd by a cloudy, dark, and tempestuous Season.

As to my Instances produc'd from *Dio* and *Jerom*, Dr. S. has nothing more to object, but that he thinks them *mistaken*^a; which, no doubt, is an undeniable confutation of them, and is besides such a dextrous Answer, as may serve to overthrow any Authority of this kind, I might be able to produce. This most certainly is playing a sure Game, and secures the Victory at all Events. If I can produce no instance, where the Word *Εκλειψις* may seem to be us'd for an extraordinary Darknes, then *Εκλειψις* must mean a *natural Eclipse*; and if I can produce any such, then the Author that uses it, is *certainly mistaken*; so either way I'm likely to be foild, and the Doctor is safe. However I flatter myself with hopes, that Dr. S. himself will be mightily *mistaken*, if he thinks such an Answer convincing. Neither will it follow from hence, because we admit such a *Sense* of *Εκλειψις* in *Dio*, that we must necessarily *believe every prodigy* recorded by him or other ancient Historians. The Doctor need be under no manner of apprehension of such a Consequence, as he seems to intimate^b; for in this Case we are only considering what those Hi-

(a) Sec. Def. p. 60.

(b) Ibid. p. 61.

storians believe or record, not what he or I must believe upon their Word. We are not disputing about the Truth or reality of the Thing, but only about the Phrase in which we find it express'd, and the Notion which the Writer himself entertained of it. If he thinks a prodigy to be real Fact and relates it as such, it is sufficient for Us, whether we receive it as true, or reject it as fabulous. So that Dr. S. may safely allow that Sense of Εκλειψις in Dio, which I contend for, without intrenching in the least on his own Incredulity.

BUT one Remark there is dropt under this Article about the Word σκότος, which falls much heavier upon me, and deserves to be carefully considered. I had said, that *the most proper Word that Astronomers and Historians could use to express such extraordinary Phænomena, as nearly resembled a natural Eclipse in Effect tho' not in the Cause, would be Εκλειψις, because as they are suppos'd. to be very like a natural Eclipse, no one Word would express that likeness so well as Εκλειψις.* That σκότος or any other Word would be low and jejune, very short and defective. Upon which Dr. S. observes, *He forgot, I suppose, that Matthew, Mark, and Luke all made use of that low and jejune, very short and defective Word σκότος.* Here, I must own, I should be justly corrected, and should readily beg pardon for what I had said, if it necessarily extends to the sacred E-

vangelists, or casts the least distant Reflection upon *their* use of the Word *σκότος*. But as it was far from my Thoughts to speak any thing unbecoming of those Holy Writers, so it is, as I apprehend, very far from the natural sense of my Words. I was speaking of *Greek Astronomers* and *Historians*, who could not have the same reason for using the Word *σκότος*, that the sacred Penmen had. These wrote a different sort of *Greek* from the others, mix'd with *Hebrew* or *Syriack* Idioms and Phrases, and often superadding a *Hebrew* Sense to a *Greek* Word; by which means it was enlarg'd and improv'd in it's signification, and became more expressive and emphatical, than otherwise it would have been in pure *Greek*. Thus the Word *σκότος* in the stile of a *Hebrew* is as strong and significative, as *Εκλειψις* can be in *Thucydides* or *Ptolemy*. It may denote alone the most extraordinary and dreadful Darkness that can happen, as it does in the LXX. Gen. I. 2. *There was σκότος* Darkness (Heb. *חשך*) upon the face of the deep. And Exod. x. 21. Where God says to Moses, *stretch out thine hand toward heaven, and there shall be* Darkness (*σκότος*) *over the land of Egypt*. It may signify likewise an *Eclipse* of the Luminaries either *natural* or *preternatural*. For the very Word us'd commonly by the *Jewish Rabbies*† to express a *natural*

(†) Vid. Buxtorf. Lexicon. Rabbin. brev. p. 959.

-Lexic. Talmudic. p. 1976.

Eclipse is קדרת *Kadruth* or קידר *Kiddur*, *Obscuratio*, *Obtenebratio*; and the first of these is rendered in *Isai.* L. 3. by σκότος, *I cloth the Heavens with Blackness or Darkness*, ἐιδύσω τὸν οὐρανὸν ΣΚΟΤΟΣ, alluding, as some Interpreters suppose, to the *Egyptian* Darkness. And such a Sense it has again *Joel.* II. 31. *The Sun shall be turned into Darkness.* Gr. μεταφραθήσεται εἰς ΣΚΟΤΟΣ. Where the *Hebrew* Word is the same as in *Genesis* and *Exodus* before, חשך *hoshhec*. From hence then it appears, that σκότος in an old *Jewish* Writer is far from being *low* and *defective*, tho' it might be so in a *Greek Astronomer* or *Historian*; the former had no stronger Word to express such *Phænomena*, the latter had his technical Εκλειψις; The former by that alone could signify as much as the other by adding Epithets to it, or using his proper terms of Art. Besides, there was a particular Reason why the sacred Penmen should use the Word σκότος rather than Εκλειψις. They were to relate that memorable Event attending the Passion of our Saviour with the plainest simplicity, and in terms the least liable to exception and misinterpretation. Now if they instead of σκότος had us'd the word Εκλειψις, the *Pagans* in after times would have artfully pleaded it against the *Christians*, to shew that this Darkness was only a common *Eclipse*; and not any extraordinary sign from Heaven upon that solemn occasion. This we may guess would have

have been the Case, by their misapprehensions and misrepresentations of this very Fact, even without any colour from Scripture, as we learn from *Tertullian* and *Origen*. To prevent therefore any misconstruction in a Point of such importance to the *Christians*, *σκότος* in the Gospel was more proper than *Εκλειψις* would have been. But *Astronomers* and common *Historians*, when they were to express an extraordinary *Darkness*, and signify the near resemblance of it to a natural *Eclipse* in effect and appearance, might use the Word *Εκλειψις* without any such ill Consequence, and at the same time convey a better Idea of it to a Reader by that term, than by the Word *σκότος*. So that as the two Cases are very different, what is said of the one is not immediately applicable to the other.

X.

THE next Article relating to *Phlegon's Omissions*, is little more than a bare repetition of the same Things over again, without any direct Answer to what I had pleaded against them. It is still unaccountable to Dr. S. that he should take notice of an *Eclipse*, and yet not any notice of the only very remarkable Circumstances of it. And I must still reply, that *antient Historians* and *Chronologers* were seldom or never so

minute and particular in Observations of this kind, as some *Moderns* are; they contented themselves very often with a bare mention of an *Eclipse*, without remarking the time or duration or any article of Moment concerning it. And this even in Cases, where something extraordinary and striking occur'd, as may be seen in *Dio* and *Servius* quoted before. An accurate *Modern* might wonder, that *neither* of these two Writers should take the least notice of the Place of the *Moon* at the Time of their *Solar Eclipse*; and that one of them (*Dio*) should not drop a syllable about the *duration, Day, or Hour* of his. Yet wonderful as this is, the Fact is certain that neither of them speak of a *natural* and *proper Eclipse*. And why might not the Author, whom *Phlegon* follow'd, be as little exact and particular? For as to *Phlegon* himself, he did not write his *Olympiads*, at the time when this Eclipse happened, but at least an hundred Years after it; and therefore could give no fuller Account of it, than he receiv'd from other Writers before him. Dr. S. indeed forgetting this Circumstance, had consider'd † him before as living at the very Time of his Eclipse; but now being advis'd of the contrary, thought it best to drop that Argument, and *tacitly* to own his mistake.

As to what is said about *Origen's* confining the *Eclipse* and *Earthquake* to the Land of *Juda*,
 (†) Def. p. 9, 10.

that likewise I had obviated before, and what I said then is a full Answer to the slender Exceptions in this *Second Defense*. It was only a private Conjecture of *Origen's*, introduc'd by a modest *arbitror* in his *Latin Work*, without one tittle of *positive Evidence* to confirm it. And even this Conjecture of his was overthrown by *Origen* himself in his Books against *Celsus*^a, where he makes no scruple of acknowledging *Phlegon* to be a Witness both of the *Eclipse* and great *Earthquake* at the Passion of Christ. Let the Reader therefore judge, which *Origen* is of most Authority; *He* who appears only in a barbarous *Latin Translation*, or *He* who is still extant in his original *Greek*. *He* who at one time offers only a private Opinion, or *He* who after more Experience and Consideration thinks fit to retract it. To which must be added, that the *Antients* in general extended the *Darkness* and *Earthquake* beyond *Judaea*. It is a *Mundi casus* with *Tertullian*^b, with *Arnobius*^c *universa Mundi sunt Elementa turbata*; and *Africanus*^d the Doctor's favourite Author declares expressly, that there *was a most dreadful Dark-*

(a) Περὶ τῆς ἐπὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Εκλείψεως ——— καὶ περὶ ΜΕΓΑΛΩΝ ΣΕΙΣΜΩΝ τῆς γῆς ἀνίσταται καὶ Φλίγων. Cont. Cels. L. II. p. 80.

(b) Tertull. Apolog: c. 21.

(c) Arnob. adv. Gent. L. I. p. 32.

(d) Καθ' ὅλας τὴν κόσμον σφόδρα γίνεται ΣΕΙΣΜΩΝ διὰ αἱ πέτραι διαρρήγνυνται, καὶ πᾶς πολλὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς γῆς καταρρίφει. Ap. Syncell. p. 322.

ness over the whole World, the Rocks were rent by an Earthquake, and many Places in Judaea and other parts of the Earth were thrown down. Now why must all these Writers, nay why must Origen himself in his Greek and genuine Work, be rejected in complaisance to one obscure and suspicious Passage of the *Latin Origen*? If you say, because we have no Evidence from Pagan Writers for what they say, in a Fact that all the World must be surpriz'd at; I answer, that Tertullian^f appeals to the Roman Archives for an Account of this Fact, whose Authority in point of Learning or History is as good as any Greek or Roman's of his Time. And pray, who are the Pagans that object an universal silence in their Histories as to the *Darkness* and *Earthquake*? Why only some anonymous Gentlemen, introduc'd as violent Enemies to the Christians in the *Latin Tractatus*, and mightily dispos'd to cavil at all Events; whose Sincerity and Knowledge we may guess at by their calling the Darkness at the Passion a *common Eclipse* of the Sun, which was evidently false; and when that would not serve their turn, then they ask, *how comes it pass* that

(e) See. Def. p. 70.

(f) Eum Mundi casum in *Archivis vestris* habetis. Tertull. Apolog. c. 21.

To the same Roman Annals does the Martyr Lucian appeal. *Requirite in annalibus vestris, invenietis temporibus Pilati, Christo patiente, fugato Sole, interruptum tenebris Diem. apud Rufin. Hist. Eccles. L. IX. 6.*

only *Christian* Writers take notice of this extraordinary Event, and no other *Greek* or *Barbarian* of that time? What proof is this, that no *Pagan* did really take notice of that extraordinary Event? Must we necessarily allow their *Interpretation* of every Writer to be just and clear against us? Must *Phlegon* and *Thallus* and the *Roman Archives* and the *Greek Commentaries* mentioned by *Eusebius*^g, be all given up immediately as nothing to our purpose, because forsooth these *Pagan Objectors* will please to affirm that they are not? That, I think, would be paying more deference to a *Pagan's* word, and less to a *Christian's*, than is due from any *Christian* Author. As to *Origen's* Answer to them, that has been consider'd before^h, and may now be dismiss'd.

THE last difficulty that lies in our way is this; *Phlegon* observes that in his Eclipse the Stars appeared in the Heavens; now had he intended any Darkness, but what arose from a proper Eclipse, he would not have added this Circumstance, because whatever obstructed the Rays of the Sun, would much more obstruct the Light of the Starsⁱ. This I called a mere Supposition, be-

(g) Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός — ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν — ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος προηΐσθης αὐτῆς Τιβεριίου Καίσαρος, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἔτι ἐν ἄλλοις μὲν ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΙΣ ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΣΙΝ εὐρομην ἰσχυρόμενα κατὰ ΔΕΞΙΝ ταῦτα, Ὁ Ἥλιος ἐξέλειπεν, Βιβουλία ἐπέσθην, Νικαίης τὰ πολλὰ ἔπασεν· ἃ ἔστιν ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸ πάθος τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν συμβεβηκόσι. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 202. Ed. 1658.

(h) Sec. *Phlegon* examined p. 76, 77. (i) Sec. *Def.* p. 70, 71.

cause Dr. S. does evidently *suppose* and take for granted, that the Darkneſs at the Paſſion was occaſion'd by ſomething that *obſtructed the Rays of the Sun*, like *Clouds and Fogs*. Whereas I ſaid, it was much more probable, that nothing of *this* kind occaſioned the *Darkneſs* at the Paſſion; becauſe as it was *preternatural* in itſelf, ſo it was likely to be very far remov'd from any *ordinary Cauſe* of darkneſs. And to confirm this Opinion of mine, I produced the Learned *Grotius* as concurring with me, whoſe judgment, I believe, is of equal weight and influence with that of Dr. Sykes: In reply to all this, Dr. S. *deſires me to ſay ſomething that is not Suppoſition, that is more probable; and ſhew how the Sun can be hid and the Stars appear, and yet not by a natural Eclipse*. As if a bare *Suppoſition* of mine confirm'd by the judgment of *Grotius*, and probable in itſelf, was not ſufficient to answer a bare *Suppoſition* of Dr. S. in which he is very ſingular, and without any ſupport from Antiquity. As his whole Argument in this Article was built on a *private Suppoſition* of his, it was ſufficiently answer'd, as to any *concluſive force* it could have, by another *Suppoſition* of mine, equally probable in itſelf, and ſupported by *Reasons*, which the Doctor has not attempted to invalidate. As to *ſhewing, how the Sun could be hid, and the Stars appear without a natural Eclipse*, I pretend not to do it in a *natural way*; but certainly ſuch a Divine Power,

Power, as displayed itself in a miraculous manner at the Passion of Christ, might easily effect this, and most probably did effect it, to distinguish the wonderful *Darkness* of that time, from any *natural* and *ordinary* one. Whether this be *writing like an Advocate retained for a Cause*, as the Doctor very candidly insinuates, I leave to the arbitration of those, who are not wedded to a darling Hypothesis.

AND now having carefully examined every Article of moment, in which I am concerned thro' the whole *Defence*, I shall sum up in short the Evidence, which manifestly appears in favour of my reading of *Phlegon*. *Eusebius*, the first Writer, that quotes the *very Words* of *Phlegon*, represents his Eclipse as happening in the *fourth* year of Ol. 202. the year of our Saviour's Passion. And the numeral *δ* in *Eusebius* is fix'd beyond all dispute by the *Latin* Translations of *Ferom* and *Anastasius*. In the same manner does the *Chronicon Paschale* quote *Phlegon* in two different places, who is prov'd to be no Transcriber from *Eusebius*, but an *Original* Citer from *Phlegon*. *Philoponus* likewise is shewn to agree with the other two in the same numeral, being fully clear'd from the late Exceptions of Dr. S. against it. To which may be added as *probable* Testimonies, the *Historia Miscella*, and *Freculphus Lexovien-sis*. Besides all this the Objections drawn from *Africanus*, and *Origen*, and the Circumstances of

of *Phlegon's* Eclipse, are particularly examined and confuted. Thus stands the Evidence on our side. Dr. S. on the other side has not *one positive* Authority to countenance his *first* or *second* year of Ol. 202. and all that he offers for it is merely presumptive and conjectural, and that, I hope, effectually overthrown in the pages preceding. Upon this Representation of the Case, I leave the Reader to determine where the strongest Evidence lies, and readily agree with the Doctor to trouble him with nothing further in this Controversy.

P O S T S C R I P T.

HAVING occasion in the Course of this Dispute, to quote a Passage or two from the *Chronicon Paschale*, I had intimated to the Reader, that the Learned *Du Fresne* discover'd the *Chronicon* to be really made up of two parts, compos'd by different Authors at different times, the first beginning with *Adam* and ending A. D. 354. in the XVIIth of the Emperor *Constantius*, and the second continuing it down from that year to the XXth of the Emperor *Heraclius* A. D. 630ⁱ. I likewise observ'd from thence, that the Testimonies cited from the *Chronicon* in relation to *Phlegon*, were probably much more

(i) *Phlegon* examined. p. 17.

antient, than they are commonly supposed and represented, being extant in the former part of it, and consequently not to be placed lower than A. D. 354, a few years after Eusebius. This account of the *Chronicon* Dr. S. is not willing to allow, and he cannot by any means, he says^k, come into *Du Fresne's* Opinion about it; being still persuaded, it seems, that the whole of it belongs to one Writer, and was compos'd much later than the great *French Critick* supposes. To which purpose he produces some Passages from the *Chronicon*, wherein mention is made of Things and Persons, that are much later than A. D. 354, and yet were all in *Holstenius's* Copy, and not mark'd as *interpolations* by the Learned Editor *Du Fresne*^l. Now to give the Reader a clearer insight into the Affair, and to enable him the better to form a Judgment of what either Dr. Sykes or my self have advanc'd upon this head, I shall briefly lay before him the Grounds and Reasons for *Du Fresne's* Opinion, and then offer some reply to the Doctor's Objections. *Lucas Holstenius* a most Learned and inquisitive Man had met with a very antient Manuscript Copy of the *Chronicon Paschale*, much shorter than the old Edition of it by *Raderus*, and ending in the XVIIth of *Constantinus* A. D. 354. By comparing this MS. with the common Edition, and finding so great a difference between them, he was persuaded that

(k) Sec. Def. p. 13.

(l) Ibid. p. 14 ——— 17.

a great

a great Part of the present *Chronicon* was nothing but an Interpolation and Continuation of the Original by a later Writer, who lived in the Reign of *Heraclius* about *A. D.* 630. And accordingly *Holstenius*, in some marginal Observations upon his own Edition of the *Chronicon*, mark'd very carefully the Difference between that and his MS. and gave particular Notice what Passages of the former were wanting in the latter. The Manuscript, which *Holstenius* made use of, is suppos'd by *Du Fresne* to be that which a *Sicilian* Abbot procured from an *Oratory* in *Constantinople*, and presented to the King of *Spain*. Now from this MS. and these Observations of *Holstenius*, and not from any random Conjectures or Suspicions, was *Du Fresne* convinc'd likewise, that the Person who carried down the *Chronicon Paschale* to the Reign of *Heraclius*, was not the Author of the whole Work, but only continued it from the Year 354; inserting here and there Additions of his own even in the former Part of it; and he tells us farther, that *Francis Pithæus*, a Man of great Sagacity, had suspected the same Thing, and imagin'd the first *Chronicon* to have been written in the last Year of *Constantine the Great*, upon a bare Conjecture of his own, without any Assistance from a Manuscript *. When these Discove-

(*) Quoad igitur ætatem Chronici, cum non unus extiterit, à quo elucubratum fuerit, constat saltem illum, à quo ad *Heracli-*

rics were publish'd to the World by *Du Fresno* in his new and excellent Edition of the *Chronicon*; they were received with great Applause by the Learned, and drew the most Eminent Ecclesiastical Criticks into his Opinion. Dr. *Cave* particularly, who had different Thoughts of it before, and gave other Accounts of it in his first Volume of *Historia Lite-*

um perductum est, non esse totius operis scriptorem; sed alterius quod in annum Constantii XVII, qui est Christi CCCLIV. defierit, continuatorem & interpolatorem. Id docemur præsertim ex doctissimi Holstenii observationibus, quas Codici suo Chronici Alexandrini edito subinde affixerat, hisce ad prædictum ann. Constantii, post hæc verba *εἰς τὸν Αὐγύστου*, adscriptis: *Hic desit Auctor Chronici Paschalis, cætera sunt Continuatoris*. Id certe, subodoratus fuerit Vir admodum sagax Franciscus Pithæus, qui de hoc Chronico verba faciens, aiebat illud videri scriptum ultimo Magni Constantini anno, Feliciano & Tatiano Coss. Inde ergo colligitur primum Auctorem Paschali vixisse circa tempora Constantii, quibus adhuc vigeant de Paschalis festivitatis die Controversiæ; quæ cum recruidissent sub Heraclio _____ occasionem alteri præbuerint Paschale istud Chronicum pridem conscriptum _____ ad sua usque tempora perducendi, atque adeo priorem hanc editionem subinde interpolandi, dum sua vel aliena intermiscet. Prius istud Chronicon vidit Holstenius, & quantum conijcere licet, ex Codice MS. quem ut ex V. C. Emerico Bigotio didicimus, Abbas de Farina Siculus Regi Catholico ab Oratorio Constantinopoli comparaverat, ipsique communicaverat. Illud deinde cum editione Raderiana idem Holstenius contulit, variis ad margines adscriptis lectionibus, suis etiam interdum admixtis emendationibus & conjecturis: ubi quæ subinde erant inserta ab interpolatore, deërantque in eodem MS. exemplari diligenter adnotarat. Quinetiam in reliquis deinceps Chronici parte emendationes ex ingenio adjecit. Quæ quidem omnia in notas nostras retulimus, eique ut par est adscripsimus, tum ne alium dicamur supplasse, tum quod Viri undequaque doctissimi in re literariâ adepta pridem existimario & auctoritas Lectorem in illius sententiam haud ægrè forte adduxerit. Cang. Præfat. in Chron. Paschal. p. 8. Ed. Paris. p. 7. Ed. Venet.

varia, afterwards chang'd his Mind in his *Supplement* *, and readily acquiesc'd in *Du Fresne's* Determinations. Before Him our most Learned Dr. *Hody*, who had examined this *Chronicon* with as much Application and Accuracy as any Man, and was as able as any one to form a true judgment about it, declar'd his Approbation likewise of the same Hypothesis, and promis'd us a critical discussion of this Point, in a Work which he had then begun, but I believe never finish'd, *De Scriptoribus Rerum Ægyptiarum* †. After both these came the great *Fabricius* ‡, and he too acceded to their Party. By all which Authorities I was inclin'd myself to entertain the same Opinion of the *Chronicon*, and must still persist in it, notwithstanding the Objections now rais'd by Dr. *Sykes* against it. I allow, that the Passages produc'd by him, are not mark'd as Interpolations by *Holstenius*, or wanting in his Manuscript, as many others are; and if they really belong to the first Edition of the *Chronicon*, they will certainly prove it's composition to be later than

(*) *Historia Literar.* Vol. II. p. 218.

(†) *Hod. Prolegom.* in *Malel.* §. 33. 34.

De Chronico hocce Paschali, de illius *Ætate*, *Autore*, & *Continuatore*, & quænam existant in eo supposititia, occasionem nos habuimus ex professo differendi in alio Opere nondum edito, *De Scriptoribus Rerum Ægyptiarum*, Libro sc. illius tertio, in quo speciatim tractamus de Scriptoribus Rerum *Alexandrinarum* sive *Ptolemaicarum*. Id. *ibid.* §. 34.

(‡) *Fabric. Biblioth. Græc.* Tom. VI. p. 142.

the year 354. But my Reasons against the Argument drawn from thence are as follow.

I. *Du Fresne*, the Editor of the *Chronicon*, who had all *Holstenius's* Observations before him, was very well aware of these Passages mentioned by *Dr. Sykes*, and yet thought them of no Weight and Consequence against his Hypothesis. He plainly supposes* the long Quotation of *Dorotheus* to be inserted by the *Continuator* of the *Chronicon* in *Heraclius's* Time; and I make no doubt, but he pass'd the same Judgment upon the other Quotations of *Basil*, *Gregory*, *Eutyches*, *Apollinarius*, and *Leontius*. For observing by *Holstenius's* Copy, that the Names of *Athanasius*^a, *Basil*^b, *Epiphanius*^c, and *Dionysius*^d the *Arcopagite* had been inserted in other places by the *Continuator*, he might reasonably enough suspect, that those of *Basil*, *Gregory*, *Leontius* &c, here came all from the same hand.

II. To me there appear evident Marks of Interpolation in many Passages of the *Chronicon*, even in those which are still retain'd in the MS. of *Holstenius*, such as gross Incoherencies, Inconsistencies, and idle Repetitions, a particular examination of all which would require a distinct

(*) Unde colligere saltem liceat, ut & pariter ex hoc *Paschali*, in XX. *Heraclii* annum desinente, haud esse nuperos hosce qualescunque Scriptores, quod quidam volunt, siquidem ante annum DCC. ii vixerint. Cang. Not. in Chron. Pasch. p. 505. Ed. Par. 415. Ed. Venet.

(a) Chron. Pasch. p. 225.

(b) Ibid. p. 203, 223.

(c) Ibid. p. 23, 255, 263.

(d) Ibid. p. 220. Ed. Par.

Treatise, and shall therefore be reserv'd to another time. I may only take Notice that Dr. Hody † before me discover'd the like Adulterations in that Manuscript; and pass on now to the Doctor's Instances, in which we may discern some suspicious Circumstances and Characters, betraying, I think, a *Second Author* in Disguise. The long account of the old Prophets is introduc'd with these Words. Δέον ὃ συντόμῳ μνημονεύσαι ΚΑΙ τῶν Προφητῶν, ἃ δέξαι ΚΑΙ αὐτὸς ΔΕῖ ἔχειν Χειρὸν μυστηρίῳ προειρηκότας, καὶ ὅτι πάντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου Ἀδὰμ μεχρὲς Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ, εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν κατάρτασιν ἀφορῶσιν. Cang. *Nunc porro memorandi sunt Prophetae, atque demonstrandum quemadmodum ipsi Christi mysterium predixerint, & ut omnes ab Adam primo Hominum usque ad Joannem Baptistam ad futurum statum respexerint.* Ed. Par. p. 146. Here the first Sentence is not exactly translated, but should be rendred thus, *Hic commemorandi sunt breviter etiam Prophetae &c.* For the Words ὃ συντόμῳ and ΚΑΙ τῶν Προφητῶν deserve particular notice, and are of no small use in our present Enquiry. The whole Passage is introduc'd at the conclusion of *Darius*

(†) Neque solum Exemplar *Paschalis* vulgatum fragmentis multis additiis abundat, sed & ipsum Exemplar *Holstenianum* in aliis locis *infinita* sua habet. Ut omittam ea quæ non sunt hujus loci; quòd cætera ista cuncta de *Romulo & Romæ* in loco prædicto, quæ in Codice etiam *Holsteniano* leguntur, quæque Noster (*Malela*) quoque Autor agnoscit, *Paschali* fuerunt inserta, hinc satis probabile argumentum ducitur, quòd &c. Prolegom. in *Malel.* §. 33.

Hystaspes's

Hystaspes's Reign, and the building of the second Temple by the *Jews*. And the Author sets out with his account of the Prophets and their *Prophecies*, as if he had said nothing before either of one or the other, and as if he had been speaking of the *Mystery* of Christ's Incarnation and of *John the Baptist* in the Words just preceding. For let any one consider the Δέον ἐν συντόμῳ μνημονεύσαι ΚΑΙ τῶν Προφητῶν, and δεῖξαι ΚΑΙ αὐτοὺς περὶ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν μυστηρίου &c. and I'm much mistaken, if he can give any other sense of the ΚΑΙ in those places. Now so far is either of these Cases from being true, that 1st, The whole Passage comes in abruptly, without any connection with what went before, being inserted between the last year of *Darius* and the first of *Xerxes*, where there was no manner of room or occasion for it, nothing to require or introduce it. And 2^d. 'Tis observable, that there had been Accounts already given of the Prophets ἐν συντόμῳ, sometimes in the same and sometimes in other Words, under the Reigns of the several Kings in whose time they liv'd †. Is it likely

(†) See. Joel. p. 95. Ed. Par. 76. Ed. Ven.

Jonas. p. 82. Par. 102. Ven.

Isaias. p. 105. 117. Par. 84. 95. Ven.

Michaias ibid.

Joel. ibid.

Amos. p. 106. Par. 85. Ven.

Sophonias. p. 119. Par. 96. Ven.

Zacharias. p. 142. 144. 145. Par. 114. 116. Ven.

Jeremias. p. 128. 130. Par. 103. 104. Ven.

then,

then, that the *same* Author would afterwards formally usher in a long Story about the Prophets with a Preface, as if he had hitherto mentioned nothing about them, and in a place so improper and foreign to that Subject, and in a way so abrupt, not to say impertinent? To me it seems very improbable, and I cannot but consider the whole as a Supplement of some busy and officious Continuator.

So likewise as to the Passage where *Eutyches*, and *Apollinarius* are mentioned, the very Form of it convinces me, that it does not belong to the Original *Chronicon*. It has a Title prefix'd to it Εἰς Παῦλον ἡ Απόστολον *, and then proceeds to shew at large by a great multitude of Quotations from Scripture, what was prov'd just before in a summary and general way, that there are only two *καταστάσεις* or States of Existence warranted by Scripture, the present here upon Earth, and the other in a new World hereafter. And this it does in opposition to those, who maintained, that there were other *καταστάσεις* or Worlds before the present, and that others would likewise exist after that which we expect in the next Life. Now this very Subject had been handled briefly in the

Ezekiel. p. 136, 137. Par. 109, 110. Ven.

Daniel. p. 122, 125, 126, 127. 140. Par. 98. 101, 102.

111. Ed. Ven.

Malachias. p. 130. Par. 104, 105. Ven.

Zacharias *ὁ ἐκ Ιουδαίᾳ*. p. 101. Par. 81. Ven.

(*) Chron. Paschal. p. 234. Ed. Par.

page immediately preceding, the Conclusion of which is, *Τέτοις πᾶσι μαρτυρεῖ ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος, ὡςπερ καὶ οἱ Εὐαγγελισταί, καὶ οἱ πάντες Προφῆται προκατήγγειλαν πάντα ταῦτα, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς διῴκει πάντα καὶ ἑξήκωσεν καὶ πάλιν πεποίηκε, καὶ ποιεῖ, ἣν καὶ προκατήγγειλε διὰ σώματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν. Καὶ οὕτως περὶ ταύτης τῆς χαλασάσεως ἑτέραν ἀπεφώνησεν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πάντων τῶν Προφητῶν καὶ Ἀποστόλων δύο μόνον ἐξέειπε, ταύτῃ δὴ καὶ τὴν μέλλουσαν. Here, you see, the Argument is fairly and regularly ended; and yet in the next words *Εἰς Παῦλον καὶ Ἀπόστολον, &c.* The same Argument begins again, and is pursued thro' five whole pages with as much warmth and Vigour, as if not one syllable had been dropt before concerning it. Does this look like the genuine product of one and the same Author, to talk thus backwards and forwards in different Forms and Strains upon same Subject? Or rather, is it not a plain Indication, that two different Authors are speaking here, tho' their Names are concealed? To me, I must own, it is past dispute, and I believe, whoever will consult the *Chronicon*, and consider this Passage, will be apt to entertain the same Opinion of it. But before I leave it, I must observe farther, that this whole Passage from p. 235 to p. 240 inclusive, belongs to the same Author, that gave us the long Account of the Prophets mentioned before. For I find in this a manifest reference to the other, which I wonder *Du Fresne* did not take notice of.*

6f. About the middle of it we have these Words. Ἰδοὺ ΔΕΔΕΙΚΤΑΙ ὧς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν Προφητῶν πάντων, ὡς ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΩΤΟΠΛΑΣΤΟΥ ΑΔΑΜ ΜΕΧΡΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΒΑΠΤΙΣΤΟΥ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΜΕΛΛΟΥΣΑΝ ΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΙΝ ΑΦΟΡΩΣΙΝ. Here the

Author tells us, that he has *prov'd* from the *Men of Old*, and *all the Prophets*, that from *Adam* to *John the Baptist*, they all look to the *future State* of Things, which is to succeed the present. And yet in this place there is no such *proof* to be seen from the *Men of Old* and from the *Prophets*, not so much as one Quotation from any of them, nor a line about them. But if we go back to the History of the *Prophets*, there we may see the whole explained, and the *proof* of this grand Point deduced particularly thro' all the *Prophets*, which is no where else to be found throughout the *Chronicon*. And farther to confirm this Remark, the Passages about the *Prophets*, is introduc'd with the very Words that are us'd in this place; Δείξαι — ὅτι πάντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου Αδάμ μέχρις Ἰωάννη καὶ Βαπτιστοῦ εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν κατάστασιν ἀφορῶσιν. pag. 147.

Does not this shew, that both the Passages, however disjoyn'd and distant from one another, are nearly related, and came originally from the same Hand? To which let me add, that the Stile in both is exactly the same; rhetorical, declamatory, and luxuriant, and differing very much from other parts of the *Chro-*

nicon. From whence likewise I cannot but suspect, that several of the Digressions upon *Adam*, *Abel*, *Noah*, *Melchisedec*, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, being wrote in the same sort of Stile, and applied to the same purposes, were penn'd by the same Writer; for these are the οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνθρωποι referr'd to in the Passage above, and in those Digressions alone is it *proved*, that *they* with the *Prophets* all look towards a *Future State*.

To go on. The third Passage objected by *Dr. Sykes* is that, wherein *Basil* and *Gregory Nazianzen* are cited. But here too, I think, as in the others, one may discern the Traces of a second Author. In p. 226. we are told, that some Enemies of the *Christians* had censured the Church for calling the Festival of our Saviour's Resurrection by the Name of Πάσχα or *Passover*. To which the Answer given is, that since the Hebrew word פֶּסַח (פֶּסַח) signifies in Greek, διάβασις, καὶ ἔκβασις, καὶ ὑπέρβασις, it was properly enough applied to the Resurrection of Christ, because ὡς τὸ πάθος τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ τῇ Αναστάσει αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἔκβασις καὶ ὑπέρβασις ἢ τῇ ἀνθρώπων φύσει εἴληφε τὸ ἔχοντος τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ τὸ θάνατον καὶ τὸ ἄδου καὶ τὸ φθορᾶς. From whence the Inference and Conclusion is, that ἀναστασις ἢ τῷ Θεῷ ἐκκλησία ἐ μόνον τὸ πάθος τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ Πάσχα προσαγορεύει. Thus far the Argument seems to be carried by the first Author. In the next page the same Objection is considered

sidered again, and the former Answer to it improv'd by shewing it to be grounded on a Misinterpretation of the *Law of Moses*; repeating also the signification of the word *Φασέχ*, but giving different *Greek* Translations of it; for here the *Greek* words for it, are *Διαβάτης*, and *Υπερβάσια*, and the Authorities appealed to are *Philo* and *Josephus*. Now is it likely, that one and the same Author would write after this manner? That in one page he would interpret the word *Φασέχ* by *Διάβασις*, *Ἐκβάσις*, and *ὑπέρβασις*, and in the next by *Διαβάτης* and *Υπερβάσια*, rejecting the former, and adding new Authorities? Certainly not; and for this Reason as well as other Circumstances of the Place, I suspect this part to have been added as a Supplement by some later Hand, which inserted likewise in the following page being a Continuation of the same Subject the Quotations from *Basil* and *Gregory*.

THE fourth and last Difficulty relates to *Leontius*, whom our Author mentions as living a good while before himself, and relating to those that liv'd before him the Story of *Babylas's* Martyrdom. Now *Leontius* liv'd, says *Dr. Sykes*, under *Julian*, and died A. D. 358. Here therefore, it seems, is sufficient Evidence, that there is no Foundation for placing this Writer so early as *Du Fresne* has done †, i. e. so early as 354. But this sufficient Evidence I must dispute a little by the

(†) Sec. Def. p. 16, 17.

Doſtor's leave, there being ſome room for queſtioning it's Truth and Authority. The Story from *Leontius* is introduc'd in the *Chronicon* after ſuch a manner, and is ſo ill connect- ed with the Sentence immediately following it, that I doubt very much, whether it bears the ſame Age with the reſt. The whole Paſſage being ſhort is tranſcrib'd and laid before the Reader in the Margin *, that he may judge the better of my following Obſervations upon it. We have here a *Traditional Account* from *Leontius* concerning *Babylas*, and the cauſe of his *Martyrdom*; and yet it is not plac'd where the *Chronicon* in the courſe of it's Hiſtory ſpeaks particularly of *Baby- las* and his *Martyrdom* under *Decius*, but after that Account is ended, after the Succeſſor to *Baby- las* in the See of *Antioch* *Flavius* is named, nay after the Sufferings of many others in the *Eaſt* and *other Provinces* are mentioned. Is not this a little ſtrange and ſurprizing, if one Perſon was the Author of both Accounts? How comes he to omit this Story, while he was diſcourſ-

(*) Εἰς ἀρχὴν βασιλείας Δεκίου ΒΑΒΥΛΑΣ τῆς Ἀποχρίων Ἐπίσκο-
πος τῶν ἑκ μάρτυρος δόγμα ἰταλιάνου. Μὲν δὲ Ἀποχρίων ὡς οὗτος ὡ.
Φλαβίος ἔτη γ. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἄλλοι ἐν τῇ Ἀστυλῇ ὡς οὗτος ὡς
Χριστὸν πίστεως, ἔν τῃ ἄλλαις Ἐπαρχίαις ἰταλιάνου. ΚΑΤΑ ΔΙΑΔΟΧΗΝ
δὲ ἔλθῃ καὶ οὗτος πρὸ τοῦ ἁγίου ΒΑΒΥΛΑ, ὡς διαγνώσκει τοὺς πρὸ
ἡμῶν ὁ Μακάριος. ΛΕΟΝΤΙΟΣ ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος Ἀποχρίων. Οὗτος δὲ Δί-
κας ἀνέειλε τὸ ἅγιον Βασιλεῖον, οὗτος δὲ Χριστιανὸν μόλις, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ
ἐπέλυσεν ἐκείνῃ τῇ Βασιλείᾳ Φιλίππου τὴν γυναικα καὶ αὐτὸν Φί-
λιππου εἰσέλθον εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, παρενομήσαντος Φιλίππου. Ἦν
δὲ παρενομία αὐτῇ. Φίλιππος ἑκπαρχὸς ὦν ἐπὶ τοῦ Γερμανοῦ, πα-
ρενόμην ἔλαβε πρὸς Γερμανοῦ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ καὶ τελευταίοντος Γερ-
μανοῦ τοῦ Βασιλέως, σφάξας τὸν πῶτον Φίλιππος ἑκαστοῦ. ΚΑΙ ὁ
Σμύρνης τῆς Ἀσίας, Πιόνιος ἐν ἄλλοις πολλοῖς ἱμαρτοῦ ὧς. p. 270.

ing of *Babylas*, and to bring it in afterwards, when he had pass'd from *Babylas* to other *Martyrs*? If the whole was penn'd by one Author, no probable Reason can be given, why the two Accounts should be thus disjoyn'd, and the latter plac'd so improperly; but if a second Hand be suppos'd to intrude itself here, it may be easily accounted for. For the second Author might observe, that the End of *his* Passage would by no means agree with the *subsequent Original* relation, if he tacked it to the first Account of *Babylas*; because *he* ends with the death of the Emperour *Gordian*, and with Φίλιππος Εξατίλευσιν, and the *other* would begin with ΜΕΘ' ΟΝ Ἀποχύας ἡγῶνται 17. Φλάβιος, which would sound very odd and harsh, not to say impertinent and ridiculous. For this Reason he would chuse to place his Insertion more commodiously, and remove it a little distance, to save appearances. But tho' by this prudent management he avoided one difficulty, yet he runs himself unguardedly upon another, which still bears hard upon him, and betrays the whole artifice. For the Sentences immediately following this Passage about *Babylas*, are not much better connected with it as it stands at present, than the other would have been; the Words subjoyned to it are, ΚΑΙ ἐν Σμύρῃ ἡ Ἀσίας, Πόλις σὺν ἄλλαις πολλαῖς ἐμαρτύρησιν &c. Here now we have a ΚΑΙ that should naturally joyn this Sentence with the preceding, and imply that both

both are penned upon the same Subject, and resemble one another in *Sense*. But instead of that, the Sentence foregoing is quite of another kind, telling us that *Philip* was entrusted by *Gordian* with the Care and Guardianship of his Son, and that *Gordian* dying, *Philip* destroyed this Son of his, and placed himself upon the Throne. How does this tally with the next words, *And in Smyrna a City of Asia Pionius with many others suffered Martyrdom*? Is not this a very odd and absurd *Copulation* to be made by a *KAI*? Or, could there well be Sentences more *disjunctive* and *dissonant* than these appear to be? But take away the whole Passage about *Babylas*, and then all will be clear and easy; *Kai ἐν Σμύρνῃ τῆς Ἀσίας Πιόνιος &c.* will naturally and properly follow *Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ — καὶ ἐν ἄλλαις Ἐπαρχίαις ἐτελειώθησαν*. Here the *KAI* makes a just and regular Connection, which it does not in the other Case. Wherefore I am very apt to believe, that this was the *original* Connection, and that afterwards it was chang'd by another Author to make room for his Story of *Babylas*.

By this time then, I hope, it may appear, that *Du Fresne's* Opinion of the *Chronicon Paschale*, that it was really compos'd by two different Authors at different times, was not without good Foundation and Authority; and that all *Dr. Sykes's* Objections against it rather serve to confirm than overthrow it. For we see,

see, the very Passages alledg'd by him in opposition to it, do themselves, when narrowly examined, afford us new Arguments in its favour. And if the *Chronicon* itself thus discovers two different Authors concerned in the Composition of it, why may not we admit what the antient Manuscript of *Holstenius* assures us, that one of these Authors lived in the Reign of *Constantius* about A. D. 354, and the other in *Heraclius's* about A. D. 630? It is true, the MS. does not give us the original *Chronicon* quite pure and perfect, but that is no reason, why we should not regard what it says as to the different Authors and Ages of them. For 'tis impossible to explain, how so antient a MS. of the *Chronicon* should be as it is, if one Person had been the Author of the whole, and liv'd so late as *Heraclius's* time; but 'tis easy to conceive how some Adulterations might creep into it, if we suppose with *Holstenius* and *Du Fresne* two different Editions of it at different Times, the *first* publish'd by an Author in the *fourth* Century, the *second* by another with large Additions and Adulterations in the *seventh*. Upon the first Supposition no probable Reason either from *Negligence* or *Design* can be given, why the MS. should be so short and defective as to want two thirds of the whole *Chronicon*, and to end in the year 354; but many may be given upon the latter, why it is not quite free from the later Additions to the *original*

original Chronicon. These Considerations therefore prevail with me to embrace *Du Fresne's* Opinion; perhaps if I had the same Opportunities of consulting the Manuscript, which *Holstenius* and *Du Fresne* enjoyed, I might be furnish'd with other Arguments upon this Subject; but being debarr'd from a Sight of that, I can add nothing farther at present to what has been said. Only one thing I must observe with respect to *Phlegon*, that the Passages quoted from him were extant in *Holstenius's* Copy; and they are so well circumstantiated, that I can see no ground after the most diligent and impartial Examination of them for attributing both to any *second* Hand. The first of them indeed seems to me an indisputable part of the *Original Chronicon*, being liable to no Exception or Difficulty, that I can perceive; the latter (to be ingenuous) may possibly admit of a Query, tho' even *that* is less doubtful and suspicious, than any one of the Passages urged against me by *Dr. Sykes*. However let their fate in this respect be what it will, we are certain that both these Quotations were taken from *Phlegon* while that Author's *Olympiads* were in being, and their Authority in the present Dispute will still remain unshaken and insuperable.

6 MAY 35

F I N I S.

